6375
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
SANTA MARIA BRANCH; COOK STREET DIVISION
DEPARTMENT SM-2 HON. RODNEY S. MELVILLE, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2005

8:30 A.M.

(PAGES 6375 THROUGH 6418)

REPORTED MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304
BY: Official Court Reporter 6375

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For Plaintiff: THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.,
District Attorney -and-
RONALD J. ZONEN, Sr. Deputy District Attorney
-and- GORDON AUCHINCLOSS,
Sr. Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

For Defendant: COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU BY: THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ESQ.
-and- SUSAN C. YU, ESQ.
1875 Century Park East, Suite 700 Los Angeles, California 90067
-and-
SANGER & SWYSEN
BY: ROBERT M. SANGER, ESQ. 233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C
Santa Barbara, California 93101
-and-
OXMAN and JAROSCAK BY: R. BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ.
14126 East Rosecrans Boulevard Santa Fe Springs, California 90670
(Not Present)

I N D E X

Note: Mr. Sneddon is listed as “SN” on index.
Mr. Zonen is listed as “Z” on index. Mr. Auchincloss is listed as “A” on index.
Mr. Mesereau is listed as “M” on index. Ms. Yu is listed as “Y” on index.
Mr. Sanger is listed as “SA” on index. Mr. Oxman is listed as “O” on index.

PLAINTIFF’S WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
JACKSON, Janet	6379-Z	6399-M (Contd.)		

1 E X H I B I T S
2
3 FOR IN PLAINTIFF'S NO. DESCRIPTION I.D. EVID.
4
5 815 DVD 6383 6398
6 816 DVD 6388 6398
7 817 DVD 6393 6398
8 818 DVD 6396 6398
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 6378

Santa Maria, California
Friday, April 15, 2005
8:30 a.m.

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.
THE JURY: (In unison) Good morning.
COUNSEL AT COUNSEL TABLE: (In unison)
Good morning.
THE COURT: Counsel, you may proceed.
MR. ZONEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

JANET JACKSON
Having been previously sworn, resumed the
stand and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
BY MR. ZONEN:
Q. Miss Arvizo, good morning.
A. Good morning.
THE BAILIFF: Do you have your microphone
on?
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Miss Arvizo, good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Yesterday I asked a few questions about your
testimony with regards to your being followed at
times. Did you ever see people actually filming
you?
A. Yes. 6379

Q. Do you remember where and when you saw people filming you?
A. At Jay's home. My children's school. At church. Everywhere.
Q. And I had asked you if you recognized any of those people. Did you recognize any of those people?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And could you tell us the names of any of the people you saw?
A. One of them was Johnny, and I think one other time was Asaf, and then there was one to three people. And then after we left, permanently left Neverland, that's the first time I ever saw a female, in addition to a group of males.
Q. Prior to coming into court today, on a couple of different occasions did you have an opportunity to view videotapes of different persons being filmed out on the street and at other locations?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you recognize the people who are the subject of those films?
A. I sure did.
Q. And who were they?
A. My mom, my dad, my daughter.
Q. Davellin?
A. Davellin. My boys, Gavin and Star. And my 6380

now husband Jay Jackson.
MR. ZONEN: And, Your Honor, we're prepared
to play it at this time.
THE WITNESS: And myself.
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: You were among them?
A. Yes.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. ZONEN: We need a moment. Excuse me.
Just one moment. Your Honor, I'm sorry, we need to
reboot the computer. It's going to take a moment.
THE COURT: What's the exhibit number on
this?
MR. ZONEN: I'm going to withdraw the other
exhibit, the DVD, and we're going to do this as
three separate DVDs.
THE COURT: Actually, I don't think you can
withdraw it. There were objections made concerning
it. It will have to remain in evidence.
MR. ZONEN: That's fine.
THE COURT: Not in evidence, but it will
have to remain as an exhibit. Not in evidence.
MR. ZONEN: All right. Then we'll simply
give three new exhibit numbers to these three DVDs.
THE COURT: While that's being done, could I
ask counsel to, each of you, file a response to the
special master's report Monday so that I know what
your positions are on that?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor. 6381

THE COURT: And a response from the defense to the supplemental motion that was served on me today, probably due today.
MR. MESEREAU: I have not seen that, Your Honor.
MR. SANGER: We received a motion this morning. Is that what you're referring to?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Is that what you're referring to?
THE COURT: They can't hear you.
MR. SANGER: We received a motion this morning, if that's what you're referring to.
THE COURT: Yes. You might respond to that by Monday also.
MR. SANGER: Monday at 3:00.
THE COURT: At what?
MR. SANGER: At 3:00. Or Monday morning at 8:00?
THE COURT: Yes. That would be good.
MR. ZONEN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: You ready?
MR. ZONEN: Almost.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Some technical difficulties. I think what we'll try to do, Your Honor, is play it on the DVD player, so we'd ask you to go to "Input 4."
BAILIFF CORTEZ: Sir, your microphone's off. 6382

MR. ZONEN: We also have the VCR here. We can do it on that. Either way we'll be able to do it this morning, if the computer doesn't work. In the meantime, could I wrap up a little bit of old business? Exhibits 809 and 810 that are already in evidence are tapes in the form of a DVD and a CD -- CV -- CD. And the Court was waiting for transcripts from the People. We have those transcripts and they are now numbered 809-A and 810-A, and a copy has been furnished to the defense. I'll submit that to the Court at this time.
THE COURT: All right. And you're offering 809 at this time?
MR. ZONEN: 809 is not in evidence. We are offering it into evidence. That's right.
THE COURT: All right. That's admitted. And 814, did you mention that?
THE CLERK: 814 is the one that had writing on the back. They were going to do it later.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Can we go to "Input 1" -- or "Input 4," Your Honor?
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 815, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Miss Arvizo, we've now -- this frame is stalled at this spot here. Can you tell us what we're looking at?
A. You're looking at my mom's house.
Q. This is in El Monte? 6383

A. This is in El Monte.
Q. All right. The building -- the front portion of the building -- do you have the laser? This front portion, is this portion your parents' house, as well?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What is it?
A. That's the garage area.
Q. That's a gate that's in front of the house along here?
A. Yes.
MR. ZONEN: All right. Let's go ahead and proceed.
Excuse me just one second before we start.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: It just went dark. But I can back it up.
MR. ZONEN: Let's start here.
Q. On February 14 of '03, do you know where you were on that day?
A. I think -- to my best estimate, I think I was already at my mom's house. I think that, to my best estimate, is when Jesus had brought me back.
MR. ZONEN: Okay. Let's go ahead and advance it.
THE WITNESS: And notice the time. 6:40 a.m.
MR. MESEREAU: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained. No question pending.
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: All right. This is still 6384

your parents' house?
A. This is still my parents' home.
Q. And the last entrance on there was 10:35 a.m.?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.
THE COURT: Just for the record, what number is the exhibit you're showing now?
MR. ZONEN: 815, Your Honor. This is 815.
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Do you now recognize the picture that you're looking at?
A. By the shape of the tree, the shape of the top of the garage and the white area above the garage door, that's my mother's home. This is after my -- Jesus had brought us back.
Q. And the -- on this frame are the words and numbers February 15, '03, 6:09 a.m.
Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 815, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Go ahead and stop.
Q. This frame now reads February 15, '03, 1:04 p.m. Miss Arvizo, what are we looking at right now?
A. You're looking at my parents' home from a different angle. And this is still my best estimate from when Jesus helped me and my children come out of Neverland.
Q. The building that we're looking at right 6385

now - and I'm pointing with the laser in front - is that the garage?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And your parents' residence over here to the left?
A. Yes, that is the complete home.
Q. All right. And the entryway into the -- is from the garage over here?
A. No. This way.
Q. Over this way?
A. Yes.
Q. On this side, to the left is the garage?
A. Yes, it is.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 815, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Now, this says in the lower right February 15, '03, 3:07 p.m. And what are we looking at here?
A. You are still looking at my parents' home.
Q. There's the one right there.
A. Okay.
Q. Show us, please, where your parents' house is.
A. This is -- right here is the door, my parents' front door. Right here.
Q. The red car that we see in the driveway, is that --
A. That is the neighbor's car. 6386

Q. And your parents' garage, can you see it?
A. It's right here. Here's the white of the top of the front of the garage. There's the garage door. You walk around this way, and right there is the front door.
MR. ZONEN: Okay. Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 815, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Who is this person?
A. This is my father.
Q. And go ahead and point the laser so we can see where he is.
A. And I think --
MR. ZONEN: Advance it a little bit.
THE WITNESS: Right -- right there.
MR. ZONEN: Okay. Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 815, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Stop right there.
Q. That person walking by, who is that?
A. This is my mother.
Q. And right now we're looking at the lower right-hand corner of the frame, it says February 15, '03, 3:51 p.m.
Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 815, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Stop right there. 6387

Q. We're looking at a new frame that says
February 15, '03, 8:12 p.m. Do you recognize the
subject matter of what you're able to see?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is that, please?
A. This is now the underground parking of Jay's
apartment building.
Q. Is that the one on St. Andrews?
A. Yes, it is.
MR. ZONEN: Your Honor, we're going to
change tapes at this time.
The next tape, Your Honor, is 816.
THE COURT: 816?
MR. ZONEN: Yes.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Can we go to "Input 4,"
Your Honor? Or "Input" -- yes, "Input 4."
Thank you.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's
Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: This now says February 19,
'03, at 5:56 p.m. Whose car is that?
A. This is Jay Jackson's car, my husband.
Q. Can you tell who's driving?
A. This is my husband who's driving.
Q. And the location now?
A. This is the underground parking of Jay's
apartment on St. Andrews.
MR. ZONEN: Go ahead. 6388

(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Stop it.
Q. We're now looking at a frame that reads February 19th, '03, at 6:01 p.m. Can you tell what we're looking at here?
A. Yes, you're looking at my husband Jay Jackson.
Q. Do you know where he is? Can you tell?
A. He is in an area called Larchmont. It's in -- there's different -- it's kind of like a -- different eating places. Different -- a marketplace in Larchmont. Near where Jay Jackson used to live.
Q. It's in Los Angeles?
A. Yes, it is.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Let me stop at this moment and ask you a question.
A. Yes.
Q. I believe that you had testified before that it was at the end of the day of the 19th that you went to Calabasas for the video; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know where you were at approximately six o'clock in the evening?
A. I was inside Jay's apartment.
MR. ZONEN: Go ahead. 6389

(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Are we still following your husband?
A. Yes, you are still -- they're still following my husband.
MR. ZONEN: Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: The frame that we've stopped is February 21, '03, 2:04 p.m. Tell us who we're looking at here.
A. This is me and --
Q. Hold on a second.
The question is simply, who are we looking at? That's you; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have a recollection of having a conversation with somebody in a Range Rover on that day?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. With whom did you have a conversation?
A. I had a conversation with Miss Karen Walker.
Q. And Karen Walker you identified previously as the social worker?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember the nature of that conversation? 6390

A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, was it your testimony previously that Vinnie was somewhere in that area?
A. Yes.
MR. ZONEN: Go ahead and play.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Stop.
Q. Miss Arvizo, who is that?
A. This is Vinnie.
Q. All right. We're now where it says February 21, '03, at 2:04 p.m. And the timeline on the lower left of this frame reads 11:33:11.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Is that Vinnie?
A. This is Vinnie.
Q. And this reads 11:45:29 is the time segment on the lower left-hand side, February 23 at 2:04 p.m.
Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Stop just a second.
Q. We're now at February 21, '03, at 3:05 p.m. It reads the time is 11:50:18. Can you tell us what we're looking at right here?
A. Yes, I can. 6391

Q. What is this?
A. This is the vehicle that I was in with Vinnie. I remember the -- that little light thing going across. And I remember the seat being above me. And that's Vinnie's hair on top of --
Q. Go ahead and show us with the laser Vinnie's hair. And then -- are you in the seat?
A. Right there. I'm in there. But the seat's higher than me.
MR. ZONEN: Okay. Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Santa Monica Boulevard is what's now showing, the street sign; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And do you remember being on Santa Monica Boulevard?
A. Yes.
MR. ZONEN: Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Who is that?
A. This is me. And in the vehicle is Vinnie.
Q. Vinnie's driving and you're getting in?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is on the 21st of February, '03?
A. Yes. 6392

Q. And the time reads at 4:15 p.m.
Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Stop.
Q. Are you in that frame?
A. I'm right here. This is Vinnie right there. This is Vinnie right there. And I'm right behind this man. Right there. You can actually see us walking up behind this couple.
Q. That couple have nothing to do with you?
A. This couple has nothing to do with me.
MR. ZONEN: All right. Go ahead. Or, hold it.
Q. Do you know where you are at this point?
A. At this moment I don't know where we're at.
Q. Or on what street?
A. I don't remember.
MR. ZONEN: Okay. Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 816, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Your Honor, the next tape we're going to look at is 817.
THE COURT: All right.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Exhibit 817, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: It reads March 17, '03, at 2:02 p.m. Can you tell us what we're looking at 6393

right now?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. And what are we looking at?
A. This is my daughter. And beyond that is my parents' home.
Q. Show us where your daughter is in the picture.
And the home?
Now, where would you and your family have been on March 17, '03?
A. On March 17, '03, my boys, myself, are with Jay. My daughter is with my parents. We have permanently now left Neverland.
MR. ZONEN: Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 817, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: This is a close-up of your daughter looking back; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And show us the house where she's going to.
A. It's right here. Right here.
Q. Is 2:02 about the time that she'd be arriving back at school?
A. Yes, it is. I enrolled my daughter and my sons almost immediately into school.
Q. She's wearing a backpack. Is that the type of backpack she traditionally took to school?
A. That is correct. 6394

MR. ZONEN: Go ahead.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 817, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: And she's looking back a second time; is that correct?
A. Yes, she is looking back and she looks frightened.
MR. MESEREAU: Objection; move to strike her comments.
THE COURT: Stricken.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 817, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Is that the name of the street that your parents' home is on?
A. This is the name of the street my parents live on.
MR. ZONEN: We have a fourth tape as well.
Q. Miss Arvizo, did you have an opportunity to take a look at a tape of the cleaning and moving of materials from a residence?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you recognize the residence?
A. Yes.
Q. Whose residence was it?
A. It used to be my apartment.
Q. Is that the Soto Street address?
A. It is the Soto Street address.
Q. And the items that were being packed up, to 6395

the extent that there were still items left, did you recognize those items?
A. Yes, I did recognize them.
Q. Whose items were those?
A. They're mine.
Q. Of any of the people who appear at any time in that film, did you recognize any of them?
A. I did recognize someone to be, I think, Asaf.
Q. Was he the one who is the photographer or the videographer?
A. Asaf is the one who did the tape-recording of the Department of Child Family Services.
Q. Hold on a second.
The question is, in the course of the --
A. Oh.
Q. -- the film that you saw previously, you're about to see --
A. Oh, okay.
Q. -- is he the one holding the camera?
A. That is correct.
Q. At one moment he appears in a mirror, is that correct?
A. Yes, he is.
MR. ZONEN: Let's go ahead and play this one.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 818, was played for the Court and jury.) 6396

Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Which room is that?
A. This is our room that me and my children and my ex-husband used to live in.
Q. And sleep?
A. And sleep in.
MR. ZONEN: Go ahead.
THE COURT: Is this 818?
MR. ZONEN: Yes, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 818, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Is that the picture that you saw before?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And at some point, were you able to hear his voice as well?
A. Yes.
MR. ZONEN: Let's resume.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 818, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Was that Asaf's voice?
A. That is Asaf's voice.
Q. The deeper voice?
A. Yes, it is.
MR. ZONEN: All right.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 818, was played for the Court and jury.)
MR. ZONEN: Your Honor, I have no further questions. 6397

1 THE COURT: Cross-examine?
2 MR. MESEREAU: Yes, please, Your Honor.
3 THE COURT: That was Exhibit 118.
4 THE CLERK: 818.
5 THE COURT: 818. Are you offering that,
6 or --
7 MR. ZONEN: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
8 THE COURT: Are those exhibits being
9 offered?
10 MR. ZONEN: Yes, they are, Your Honor. The
11 numbers are 815, 816, 817 and 818.
12 MR. MESEREAU: Thank you, Your Honor.
13 THE COURT: Are there any objections to those
14 exhibits?
15 MR. MESEREAU: No objection at all.
16 THE COURT: All right. They're admitted.
17 MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, Mr. Sanger is
18 obtaining the tape of the phone conversation between
19 Miss Arvizo and Frank Cascio, and I'm going to begin
20 with that.
21 And also, the prosecutor lodged a transcript
22 with the Court this morning of that phone
23 conversation, which, with the Court's permission,
24 I'd like to hand to the witness as we play that
25 tape.
26 THE COURT: All right.
27 MR. MESEREAU: Thank you, Your Honor.
28 May I approach? 6398

THE COURT: Yes.
The tape should be 809.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. MESEREAU:
Q. Good morning, Miss Arvizo.
A. Good morning.
Q. Miss Arvizo, as you know, my name is Tom Mesereau and I speak for Michael Jackson.
Now, you heard the prosecutor for the government play a recorded phone conversation between you and Mr. Frank Cascio, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't know that conversation was being recorded, correct?
A. No.
Q. And to your knowledge, it was probably recorded by Mr. Cascio, correct?
MR. ZONEN: Objection; speculative.
THE COURT: Sustained. Foundation.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Before it was played in court, when did you last hear that recorded phone conversation between you and Mr. Cascio?
A. I think it was during the grand jury. I think that's when it was.
Q. And you have in front of you a transcript of that phone conversation, correct?
A. Yes. 6399

Q. Have you read any transcript of that phone conversation before today?
A. I think so.
Q. And who provided you with a transcript to read?
A. When I came -- the D.A.'s Office.
Q. At this point, Miss Arvizo, I'd like to play that recorded conversation for the jury, and at various points I'm going to ask my co-counsel, Mr. Sanger, to stop the recording, and I'm going to ask you questions about what Mr. Cascio says and about what you say. Okay?
A. Okay.
MR. MESEREAU: With the Court's permission, we'll play the phone conversation, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And this is Exhibit --
MR. SANGER: 809, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And this is more than one conversation blended, put together.
MR. MESEREAU: I know your position.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. MESEREAU: We'll go through it.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE BAILIFF: Are you on "Input 1," Your Honor?
Can you check that switch and make sure it's over, the audio switch? 6400

BAILIFF CORTEZ: I hear something.
THE BAILIFF: Is it where it was?
BAILIFF CORTEZ: No, it's just a little bit --
THE BAILIFF: It should work.
BAILIFF CORTEZ: I hear it.
MR. SANGER: Is it going through the microphone?
MR. MESEREAU: Start it again.
THE BAILIFF: I can turn it up here.
MR. SANGER: This happened last time. We were told there was a switch up there, but.... One more try, Your Honor. I'm sorry.
THE BAILIFF: Did you plug it into the defense?
MR. SANGER: It's plugged into the defense. Plugged into the back. That's on. One, two, that's on. We can play it again with the speakers.
THE COURT: I think that's the best thing to do.
THE BAILIFF: They're coming right over.
MR. SANGER: Your Honor, I don't know if the Court's willing to wait for just a moment. I hear they're coming right away.
THE COURT: Would you like me to?
MR. SANGER: It would be a lot better to hear it through the system, I think.
THE COURT: All right. We'll wait. 6401

MR. SANGER: Thank you.
THE BAILIFF: We check this every day. They should be here any minute, Judge.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: While we're waiting, Miss Arvizo, let me ask you a few questions about what's said in this conversation.
You're telling the jury under oath, that you never wanted any kind of security provided to you by Frank, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you never made any statements to Frank that you needed any kind of protection, correct?
A. Uh-huh. That's correct.
Q. And when Frank offered you any type of security at your home, you always declined; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Because you never felt you needed any security of any kind from him, right?
A. No, what I said was I didn't want my parents to be scared.
Q. Are you telling the jury you didn't want any security from Frank?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in no conversation with him did you ever say anything to that effect, right?
A. That's how I feel.
Q. And did you ever tell Frank that your home 6402

was being, in effect, bombarded by media people?
A. This was after a conversation with him.
Q. Did you ever tell Frank your home was, in effect, being bombarded by media people?
A. Yes, because I believed them after they had told me, and, yes, I saw it for my own self in my parents' home.
Q. So you saw media people bombarding your home?
A. Yes. With all the mail that was left on the table.
Q. And did you ever tell anything like that to Frank?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay.
THE COURT: Would you pause so they can try to....
(Discussion held off the record.)
MR. SANGER: May I try it just to --
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you very much.
MR. MESEREAU: I think we're all set, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Miss Arvizo, do you recall telling Frank with respect to the rebuttal interview with you and your family that the Germans only want you to talk about one charitable act of Michael, but 6403

you want to talk about more than that?
A. What is your question?
Q. Do you recall telling Frank that you didn't like what the Germans were asking you to say on the rebuttal video, because they only wanted you to talk about one charitable act of Michael and you wanted to talk about much more than that?
A. That's incorrect.
MR MESEREAU: Okay. Could we play the --
THE WITNESS: There's more than that.
MR. MESEREAU: I understand. You'll have your chance to talk about it.
MR. SANGER: Ready?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Because they wanted me to do a choreograph that me and Michael had done a charity act to German orphans. And I wasn't going to do that, to say that that had happened.
MR. MESEREAU: At this time we're going to play the conversation, Your Honor. Thank you.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you're telling Frank that you love his family, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You're telling Frank that, in effect, "We're all family," right?
A. Yes. Because of Michael's initial 6404

lovey-dovey meeting.
Q. Just please answer my question, Miss Arvizo.
The prosecutor will then ask you whatever he wants.
I just want direct answers to my questions, all
right? Is that all right with you?
A. If you could simplify the questions, that
would be easier for me.
Q. I will try to make them as clear as I can.
And if you don't understand, don't answer me. Just
ask me to try and restate it. Okay?
A. Okay. That's fair enough.
Q. You told Frank Cascio in this conversation,
"We're all family," true?
A. I said, "It's like we're family." True.
Q. Did that mean in your mind that your family,
Frank's family, and Mr. Jackson's family were all
united?
A. Let me see. It says right here, "I love you
so much. You don't know how much I love your little
sister and your little brother." That's what it
said.
Q. And then later on, it says, "It's like we're
family, you know, Frank?"
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. "Like we're family."
Q. And when you said that you meant it, true?
A. Yes, I believed what he said in the initial 6405

meeting in Miami.
Q. I understand, it all comes from Miami,
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Doesn't come from your being at Neverland
with the Cascio family, does it?
A. No.
Q. Were you ever at Neverland with the Cascio
family?
A. With the whole entire family? No.
Q. With the children?
A. With the children, no, never before at
Neverland, before Miami.
Q. So one trip to Miami and you're calling
everyone family, correct?
A. Correct.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's
Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you say to Frank,
"It's like we're family, you know, Frank?" And he
says, "I know. And you say, "You know. And people
don't understand that," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And when you said, "People don't understand
that," what did you mean?
A. Well, I thought they were honest people.
And, for example, people 50 and over have a tender 6406

spot in my heart, and so it's loving someone without knowing them. That's what I mean.
Q. So what you're saying is in your mind you were family with the Cascios because you loved them without knowing them; is that correct?
A. Correct.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you say, "It's like crazy here." Do you see that?
A. I said, it goes, "Um, (inaudible), bleep, are like crazy here," so I really couldn't tell you what was before there.
Q. Let's go two lines down.
A. Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You say to Frank, "Are like crazy here," And he says, "Who?"
And you say, "The reporters and stuff."
Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And please tell the jury what you're talking about.
A. Well, in my mom's table, when I arrived from Neverland, from Jesus helping me, there was a table filled with offers, many different offers requesting 6407

interviews, some people offering cars, to various denominations, and just a variety of things. And the phone ringing over and over and over.
Q. Okay. And people were coming to your house, true?
A. And some -- some of the reporters just wanted to talk. But it was all there.
Q. They were looking for you at times, correct?
A. Mostly my children. Mostly Gavin specifically.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you're talking to Frank after you say Chris took you and, "Jesus helped me leave," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So the things you're saying to Frank on this tape --
A. Has been manipulated.
Q. Oh, I understand your position, because we'll go through that.
A. Okay.
Q. And what you're saying is you've had someone look at this tape and decide it's all been jumbled up together; right? Is that your position?
A. My position is I had the conversation. I know when I left, the first time I left with Jesus, 6408

the second time I left with Chris, two different events.
Q. Okay.
A. That's why I know.
Q. But what you say is, Ya know, ya know, Frank, when I asked to leave on Sunday night," and then Frank coughs, and then it's inaudible, and it says, "And, ah, Chris took me and, ah, Jesus helped me leave." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And obviously this conversation is happening after Jesus helps you leave?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's after Chris helped you, correct?
A. No.
Q. Why did you say then, "Chris took me and then Jesus helped me leave"?
A. Because Chris -- this tape has been manipulated. But also on that day -- Chris was the one who took me to go do the leg wax.
Q. Okay. Now, Chris was part of Michael Jackson's personal security group at Neverland, true?
A. Correct. His personal bodyguard.
Q. Yes. He's the one who took you for a body wax, correct?
A. Incorrect.
Q. Who took you for a body wax? 6409

A. No one ever.
Q. Well, you went for a body wax when you were at Neverland, did you not?
A. Inaccurate.
Q. Never did it?
A. Never did it.
Q. Never went to a salon in Los Olivos and met someone there who treated you, correct?
A. I had a leg wax done.
Q. In Los Olivos?
A. In Los Olivos.
Q. And that was the day you claim Jesus helped you escape from Neverland, true?
A. That was the day that the Germans said that they wanted to do positive PR for Michael. And I figured this is what they have and that's it. I could go now and it was still a no.
Q. The body wax you had in Los Olivos was the day that you claim Jesus helped you escape from Neverland, true?
A. His statement is inaccurate. He keeps continuously saying "body wax." There is no body wax.
Q. What did you have at the salon in Los Olivos on the day you claim you escaped from Neverland?
A. A leg wax.
Q. Okay. Okay. And how did you get to the salon to have the leg wax? 6410

A. I didn't get them to do anything. They had already arranged it, the Germans, for their positive PR for Michael. With the film crew following us.
Q. How did you get to the salon in Los Olivos from Neverland to have your leg wax?
A. Chris took me.
Q. So when you say, "And, ah, Chris took me, and, ah, Jesus helped me leave," you're talking about Chris, who is part of Mr. Jackson's security detail, taking you to Los Olivos to the salon, right?
A. For Michael's positive PR.
Q. I understand what your position is, but I'm asking you a direct question.
On the day you claim Jesus helped you escape from Neverland, that's the same day Chris took you to a salon in Los Olivos for a leg wax, correct?
A. Well, if he wants to get that technical, it was the next day, because it was closer to 1 a.m.
Q. Well, how do you escape from Neverland with Jesus and then have Chris take you for a leg wax?
A. Chris took me to have a leg wax in the afternoon. After midnight, about 1 a.m., is when Jesus helped me and my children leave.
Q. Okay. And to --
A. The next day.
Q. -- to get back to my initial point, this phone conversation is happening after you say Jesus 6411

helped you leave from Neverland, isn't it?
A. These multiple conversations are happening after Jesus helped me leave.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. All right. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you're telling Frank Cascio --
A. Just a moment, Mr. Mesereau. Where are we? I'm trying to --
Q. We're on the third page.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay? There are no numbers on the lines, but we're on the third page. If you look about midway through --
A. Okay.
Q. -- you will see your comment, "And, ah, Chris took me, and ah, Jesus helped me leave." Do you see that?
A. Okay. But we played the tape a little bit further.
Q. Yes, we did. Yes, we did. And we've stopped two quotes down.
A. Okay.
Q. We stopped where it says, "And that's how I feel." Do you see that?
A. Oh, goodness gracious. 6412

Q. Do you see it? Do you want me to point it out to you?
A. Please.
MR. MESEREAU: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Good. Thank you.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You're talking to Mr. Cascio after Jesus helped you leave, and you're telling him, "My family, so as far as me and the kids, we are family, and that's how I feel." Do you see that?
A. Yes, it says, "My family" --
Q. Yes.
A. -- "(inaudible)," and then it says, "So as far as me and the kids, we are family, inaudible, and that's how I feel."
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Frank says to you, "People out there are so evil." And you reply, "Yes, yes, Frank, they are, they are."
He says to you, "They're so evil," and you go, "Yes, I know, I know."
Right?
A. Correct.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's 6413

Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you start to talk about David, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say, “They’ve been replaying over and over the news over here and on the radio. The father said making him so, so credible, you know, even the father said. David -- he was -- there’s nine criminal charges for what he did to that kid, you know. And for what he did to me. He doesn’t pay child support and, ah, he has a restraining order to stay away from me and the kids.”
Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you’re talking about your former husband David Arvizo, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you’re talking about a criminal case against him, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that was a situation where the police were notified, right?
A. Two different criminal cases that both he pled guilty on 2001 and 2002.
Q. And one of them was an allegation that he had molested Davellin, true?
A. Not an allegation. Information.
Q. Okay. But, I mean, he was -- you know, you 6414

reported him to the police on a couple of occasions, true?
A. No. That was --
He's incorrect. I was there. He was arrested for domestic violence. In the process of being investigated for that, that's when they found out that there's more -- that this man had caused more harm not just on me, but also my children, and so that sparked an investigation on what he had done to my kids.
Q. And you did report him for having falsely imprisoned your family, true?
A. It was -- I give them the information and they did whatever they did with it.
Q. And you did report him for having molested Davellin, true?
A. They -- he's inaccurate. They asked a history about David, and the event he's referring to is something that happened way over ten years ago.
Q. Okay. In answer to my question, there was a report made that David had molested your daughter Davellin, true?
A. It was a one-sentence statement, and they were asking for the history of David.
Q. Was a report made that your former husband David had molested your daughter Davellin? Yes or no.
A. That was in the midst of all the information 6415

that they were gathering about David, so, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, it mentions a restraining order, correct?
A. On which particular restraining order are we talking about?
Q. I'm going to ask you about that.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you get a number of restraining orders against your former husband David?
A. Yes, that were issued through the Family Court and the criminal courts.
Q. And how did you do that?
A. Well, when David was arrested for domestic violence finally, the criminal courts issued something that they do routinely, a restraining order.
Q. And at some point he was reported for having violated a restraining order, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And how did that happen? Please tell the jury how the case against him for violating a restraining order came about.
A. Well, my daughter came home, told me what happened. So then I called -- I let them know, the investigating officer, what had happened.
THE COURT: Counsel?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor. 6416

THE COURT: Take our break.
(Recess taken.)
--o0o--

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE)
OF CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

I, MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304, Official Court Reporter, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing pages 6379 through 6417 contain a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within and above-entitled matter as by me taken down in shorthand writing at said proceedings on April 15, 2005, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

DATED: Santa Maria, California, April 15, 2005.

MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
SANTA MARIA BRANCH; COOK STREET DIVISION
DEPARTMENT SM-2 HON. RODNEY S. MELVILLE, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2005

8:30 A.M.

(PAGES 6419 THROUGH 6542)

REPORTED MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304
BY: Official Court Reporter 6419

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2
3 For Plaintiff: THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.,
4 District Attorney -and-
5 RONALD J. ZONEN, Sr. Deputy District Attorney
6 -and- GORDON AUCHINCLOSS,
7 Sr. Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara Street
8 Santa Barbara, California 93101
9
10
11 For Defendant: COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU BY: THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ESQ.
12 -and- SUSAN C. YU, ESQ.
13 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700 Los Angeles, California 90067
14 -and-
15 SANGER & SWYSEN
16 BY: ROBERT M. SANGER, ESQ. 233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C
17 Santa Barbara, California 93101
18 -and-
19 OXMAN and JAROSCAK BY: R. BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ.
20 14126 East Rosecrans Boulevard Santa Fe Springs, California 90670
21 (NOT PRESENT)
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 6420

I N D E X

Note: Mr. Sneddon is listed as “SN” on index.
Mr. Zonen is listed as “Z” on index. Mr. Auchincloss is listed as “A” on index.
Mr. Mesereau is listed as “M” on index. Ms. Yu is listed as “Y” on index.
Mr. Sanger is listed as “SA” on index. Mr. Oxman is listed as “O” on index.

PLAINTIFF’S WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
JACKSON, Janet	6423-M			

1 E X H I B I T S
2
3 FOR IN DEFENDANT'S NO. DESCRIPTION I.D. EVID.
4
5 5007 Document prepared by the Sheriff's Department and
6 signed by Janet Arvizo December 18, 2003 6504
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 6422

THE COURT: Counsel?
MR. MESEREAU: Thank you, Your Honor.
Q. Miss Arvizo, we were talking about the domestic problems you had with David, okay? And you said that you had obtained two restraining orders against him at various times, right?
A. I didn't obtain them. It was through the court system that they were issued.
Q. One for the criminal court system, correct?
A. Which I think, as best I can remember, is that they routinely issue them.
Q. And one through the Family Court system; is that correct?
A. Correct. That my family attorney requested.
Q. And who was your family attorney at that point?
A. Mr. Michael Manning.
Q. Okay. And when the issue came up about David Arvizo violating a restraining order, you went to court, true?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever appear in court for any hearing involving allegations that David had violated a restraining order by talking to Davellin?
A. I think that was in the course of the -- they didn't have a, what you're trying to say, that there was a separate issue. It wasn't a separate issue. It was -- as best as I can recall, it was 6423

within the midst of the domestic violence that he was arrested that he did upon me.
Q. And the violation of the restraining order that was alleged against him had to do with his showing up at school and talking to Davellin, true?
A. It had to do with the fact that he violated the restraining order.
Q. The violation of the restraining order had to do with David showing up at school and talking to Davellin, right?
MR. ZONEN: Your Honor, I'll object; lack of foundation.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: David, a grown man, was given a restraining order, and he violated it.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Let me repeat the question again. If it's not clear, tell me.
A. It's not clear.
Q. Okay. What was the nature of the violation?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Didn't David go to Davellin's school --
A. Yes.
Q. -- see Davellin outside of school and ask her to go into his car and talk to him?
A. He called -- my understanding, because I wasn't there -- the best who could explain it would be Davellin. 6424

Q. You don't know what happened?
A. I do know, but the best one who could explain it would be Davellin.
Q. What do you know about it, Miss Arvizo?
A. Okay, my understanding is that David had called her over into the car, and he wouldn't let her go until he finished his conversation with her and until he was satisfied. Then he let her go. That's my understanding. But the best one who could explain it is Davellin.
Q. You attended court with Davellin when there was a hearing with a judge on whether or not David had violated that restraining order, right?
A. Again, that was in the midst of the domestic violence that he had done upon me.
Q. Did you attend court when there was a hearing on whether or not David had violated the restraining order?
A. I think I understand what you're trying to say, but if not, please make me aware.
Q. Okay.
A. I feel that he is trying to say that I was present when these proceedings were happening in the midst of the domestic violence. That is inaccurate. She went behind a closed door with a judge, a court reporter, and a -- David, Mr. Halpern, his attorney. And that's where they had the hearing, some kind of hearing, understanding, talking. I 6425

don’t know what that process would be called.
Because he had violated the restraining order.
Q. And you were in court that day, right?
A. They did it behind closed doors, in the judge’s chambers, and I was not allowed to be present.
Q. You were in court that day, true?
A. I was in the courthouse, in the courtroom. But in the judge’s chambers when that took place, I was not present. And there was a court reporter reporting everything there.
Q. And who was with you in court that day?
A. On that day was just -- it was me and Davellin, I think.
Q. Was Carol Lamir ever in court with you?
A. With me? No. She’s my ex-husband’s, David Arvizo’s, best buddy.
Q. Was she ever in court with you for any proceeding involving domestic violence?
A. With me, never. But with David. David. That’s his girlfriend.
Q. Okay. Now, you’ve told the jury about your experience in obtaining restraining orders involving David, right?
A. I don’t understand what you’re trying to say.
Q. You’ve just told the jury about your history of getting restraining orders against David, right? 6426

A. Not history, not experience, but what happened after he committed these crimes.
Q. You never went to any court at any time and tried to get a restraining order against Mr. Jackson or anyone you thought was associated with him, right?
A. I was hoping it will just go all away. And Mr. Dickerman handled everything.
Q. You thought you were being falsely imprisoned, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You thought --
A. I didn't think it. I knew it.
Q. You thought you were being extorted, true?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Did you think you were the victim of extortion by Mr. Jackson or any people associated with him?
A. Please be more clear.
Q. Do you know what "extortion" means?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Okay. Did you think you were being restrained against your will by either Mr. Jackson or anyone you thought was associated with him?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you think you were being --
A. I didn't think it. I knew it.
Q. Did you think you were being kidnapped by 6427

Mr. Jackson or anyone associated with him?
MR. ZONEN: Calls for a legal conclusion.
Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you think you were being held against your will by Mr. Jackson or anyone associated with him?
A. Did I think it?
Q. Yes.
A. I knew it.
Q. And did you think you were the victim of either force or fear created by anyone associated with Mr. Jackson?
A. I knew it.
Q. Yet, you never went into court to get any restraining order at any time regarding Mr. Jackson, true?
A. I was too scared of him.
Q. Okay. And at the time you claim you were being held against your will, you had a number of lawyers who had represented you at that point, true?
A. I don't understand what you're saying.
Q. Well, you had a lawyer who, you just told the jury, had represented you in your domestic dispute with David, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. At some point you visited Mr. Dickerman with Jamie Masada, correct? 6428

A. Uh-huh.
Q. You had a number of meetings with Mr. Dickerman and Jamie Masada, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. At some point, Mr. Dickerman referred you to an attorney named Larry Feldman, correct?
A. This is after the fact.
Q. Is that true?
A. Correct.
Q. Never have you ever sought a restraining order against Mr. Jackson or anyone associated with him, right?
A. That's correct.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Frank Cascio says to you, "Do you know everything that David is saying is completely false." Do you see this?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And you say, "Oh, I know, I know. That's why I'm getting" -- excuse me, "That's why I'm -- I'm getting all those information. Oh, for example, ah, there was like year and a half ago, a year and a half ago, they did an investigation of me and David. We understand that -- that Michael Jackson, and Chris Tucker are involved with you and the kids, and they said -- and the kids spoke up and they said, 'They're family to us. If we didn't have Michael, 6429

if we didn't have Michael, we wouldn't have a father, a father figure in our life.'" And then the social worker, (inaudible)," it says, "(possible keys typing), okay, I'll give the person here a call named David Arvizo. And she documented it and everything and so I'm returning the note paper so you can have all these papers."
Do you see that quote?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. You're referring to an investigation of you and David, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What investigation are you talking about?
A. Okay. Remember how I told you about the Child Protective Services, that there was different people, not this group, the one that was in a different building, which was a female. This is how -- my children's state of mind at that point, because Michael had been kind to them in the initial meeting when we first met in August. That stood with them. Yeah.
Q. Well, okay. So you met Michael Jackson in August of what year?
A. Of 2000. And also Evvy, his personal assistant, made sure that we -- that the children felt and saw everything as a family environment and to see him as a father figure. This is Evvy Tavasci, his personal assistant. 6430

Q. When you were involved in the investigation
you just described --
A. Yes.
Q. -- how many times had you seen Michael
Jackson?
A. Me personally by this time, once.
Q. You had seen Michael Jackson one time, and
when you're being investigated by the Department of
Children & Family Services, you tell them that
Michael is like a father to your kids and your
family, true?
A. No. Inaccurate. It says, "And the kids
spoke up and they said 'They're family to us.'" The
children continue speaking and say, "If we didn't
have Michael -- if we didn't have Michael, we
wouldn't have a father."
My kids said that.
Q. "A father figure in our life," correct?
A. Yes, that's the children.
Q. Were you there when the kids said that to
the representatives of the Department of Children &
Family Services who were investigating you?
A. That's correct.
Q. One meeting with Michael and --
A. Not me.
Q. -- and you're calling him "family" and "a
father figure," right?
A. Yes, per Evvy Tavasci's, his personal 6431

assistant, request. And also Michael had also
pointed that out to the children in August of 2000.
Q. I'm asking about you.
A. Okay, me?
Q. You're being investigated by DCFS, true?
A. Yes. Me and David. Because when David was
arrested for domestic violence -- remember how I
told you that this particular social worker, I was
very impressed, because she didn't care about me.
All she was interested was in my children.
And that's what I thought and was hoping
that these three, who were only solely concerned
about being sued by Michael Jackson, would have had
that same position. Then all this wouldn't have
happened.
Q. Miss Arvizo, we're talking about a DCFS
investigation, by your own words, that was a year
and a half before you're quoted in the conversation,
correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. That has nothing to do with what you just
told the jury.
A. This has everything to do with it. This
is -- this, 2003. The DCFS was about -- about 2001.
So I'm giving a best estimate on this conversation.
Q. You've met Michael one time and you're using
him to defend yourself in the investigation?
A. No. Incorrect. Inaccurate. We had -- in 6432

my apartment, we had a series of different pictures. And the social worker had pointed out, because the pictures that they had taken out of my apartment when they did that little move, they were there displayed amongst many celebrities, many people. People that even donated blood were up there.
Q. Now, you told the jury when the prosecutor for the government was asking you questions that you'd always had good relationships with the Department of Children & Family Services, correct?
A. Who's "the government"?
Q. These guys.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay?
Do you remember telling the jury that you had always had good relations with the Department of Children & Family Services?
A. That's correct. Prior to this CPS meeting which they were not concerned with my children, they were just concerned about being sued by Michael Jackson, it was a positive experience. Like I said, they cared solely about my kids.
Q. And was it a positive experience with the Department of Children & Family Services when you were investigated a year and a half before this conversation with Frank Cascio?
A. That's what I'm talking about. In the year 2000, when David was arrested, they initiated a 6433

Child Family Services -- I don't know, one of those -- it's the same people, I feel, had came out to make sure that I was a good mom and make sure that the children were in a safe environment.
Q. And you used the name "Michael Jackson" and the name "Chris Tucker" in that investigation?
A. That's incorrect.
Q. So, are you not telling the truth when you say that to Frank?
A. No, no, you said if I used them. That's inaccurate. Like I said, there was pictures on my walls of different people that had been kind to my children. Amongst them was Michael, Chris, celebrities, other people, and people that had donated blood. And it was her question that she asked that sparked my children to answer that. At that moment was a time that -- that was their mindset.
Q. You were investigated by the Department of Children & Family Services in the 1990s when Gavin alleged you had abused him. Remember that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. Did you have a good relationship with the Department of Children & Family Services at that time?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. He accused you of abusing him and then he changed his mind, right? 6434

A. No, that's inaccurate.
Q. Why don't you tell the jury what happened in the investigation in the 1990s.
A. I feel -- if I'm correct, I feel that what he's talking about, it was a time when Gavin was I think in kindergarten. I think it was kindergarten. I'm not sure. And the nurse, or something like that, had said to Gavin -- and this is the best I can recall it, had said -- about Gavin going home. And then Gavin says, "No, I don't want to go home," because he didn't want to go home from school. And so he had told them that -- that if he went home, he would get in trouble or something like that. I don't remember very clear.
And so the Department of Child Family Services came out, verified that my son was in a safe environment, and that was it. It was another positive experience.
Q. He had accused you of abusing him and then changed his story, didn't he?
A. No, it's inaccurate what you're saying.
Q. You just said that to the jury, that he accused you of abuse, right?
A. And it's okay. He was a kindergartner. He was a kindergartner. And the way -- the nurse or teacher, whoever it was - this is the best I can recall - had communicated it that way to the Department of Child Family Services. And that was 6435

it. This -- it's okay.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
Thanks.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's
Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Frank says to you,
"Janet, can you do me a favor? You see what's going
with everything, and it seems like you're, like,
hiding from everybody, right?" And you go, "Yes."
See that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Who were you hiding from?
A. Well, from the people that they said that
were out to kill my children.
Q. You were also hiding from the media, weren't
you?
A. No, the media -- I was -- I was a little bit
unclear, because Michael had said that they're all
bad people.
Q. You had said they were bad people.
A. Well, because Michael in the initial meeting
in Miami had said that, and so did the Germans.
Q. I see. Okay.
A. So I believed them. I -- you know, I'm
incompetent. I don't know -- I don't have
experience with this, so I believed him.
Q. I'm sorry. Do you remember making repeated
statements that the media were harassing your 6436

family, your parents, your children, and you?
A. I don't see anywhere I say here "harassing."
Q. Did you ever say that to anyone at any time,
Ms. Arvizo?
A. In this conversation I don't think I said,
and prior to this I never did. This is per these
conversations, and this is multiple conversations.
Q. I understand your position. I'm asking you
a general question.
Did you at any time, while these events were
occurring, ever say to anybody, "The media is
harassing my family, my children, my parents, and
me"? Yes or no.
A. Well, like you said, it's general, so I'm
going to generally answer. Prior to these
conversations, which are multiple conversations, no.
Q. I understand your position.
A. It's no.
Q. So you never said -- you never complained to
anyone about the media harassing you at any time,
other than in this conversation.
A. You know --
Q. Is that true?
A. No. That's correct.
Q. Okay. This was the first and only time you
ever complained about the media harassing you and
your family?
A. And that was because, in the initial meeting 6437

in Miami, Michael had pointed out that the media were bad people, which I come to find out different now, and that the Germans had said they're bad people. I believed them.
When I got to my mom's and I saw all those offers and the constant phone calls, then it just confirmed in my mind to what they had told me. And that's it. They're just doing their job. And that's okay.
Q. Then why did you tell Frank they were harassing you at your home?
A. I didn't say they were harassing me.
Q. Never said anything like that in this conversation, true?
A. No, I didn't say "harassing."
Q. Okay. All right.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Defendant's Exhibit No. 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you tell Frank about the offers you received, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And you, in effect, tell him you're not going to accept any of them, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you say --
A. Because that's not in my nature.
Q. I understand that. We'll get to the J.C. Penney case and a few other things. 6438

MR. ZONEN: Objection; move to strike.
THE COURT: Stricken.
MR. ZONEN: It's a gratuitous comment.
MR. MESEREAU: Withdrawn.
Q. You say here, "I know we're family, Frank.
Me, you, me, my kids are family. You, Marie Nicole,
my kids, Baby Rubba are family. Michael, Marie
Nicole (inaudible), (Frank coughs). You, me, are
family and my parents. That's all I got. So that's
why when these German people...," and then it's
inaudible. Do you see that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, this conversation is taking place after
you say you escaped from Neverland with Jesus, true?
A. Correct.
Q. You're still calling Michael your family,
correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You didn't escape from Neverland at all, did
you?
A. Oh, yes, I did.
Q. And how many times did you go back after
your first escape?
A. Be more specific, please.
Q. How many times did you return to Neverland
after your first escape?
A. After I was convinced by Frank, believing
that they were good people, I went back probably -- 6439

well, they've broken it down for you guys in a period of two days. So, let me see.
I went back with -- with Chris immediately.
Came back that same day. And then when Vinnie took me back, and that's it. I think. I'm trying to be summarizing those two days' worth of information.
Q. Well, it's a total of approximately three escapes, isn't it?
A. Are you including the one where I permanently left and never went back?
Q. Yes, and maybe it's four escapes. How many times do you escape from Neverland?
A. I'm asking you. I'm asking you. Please.
Q. I'm asking you how many times, in your mind, you escaped from that dungeon Neverland?
MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: How many times did you escape from Neverland, Miss Arvizo?
MR. ZONEN: Objection; asked and answered.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
With Jesus. With Chris. And then the last time. And that's the best I can remember.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And during the period of these escapes, you're constantly referring to 6440

Michael as family to you, right?
A. Prior?
MR. ZONEN: Objection; vague as to “during the period of.”
MR. MESEREAU: I’ll rephrase it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. MESEREAU: I’ll withdraw it.
Q. Between the first and the last escape from Neverland, you were still referring to Michael as your family, right?
A. Prior to Jesus taking me, my kids and me, back to El Monte to my parents’ house, I thought he was still a good guy. I was confused and I was sad at that moment because I did not know the events or what’s happened. Now I know a lot. But in that period I only thought it was the Germans. That’s it.
Now, after, when Chris brought me back, I knew now things are problematic, things that are arising, so I’m still clueless. But as time evolves, I’m finding out more and more things. Now today, I know different.
Q. Ms. Arvizo, getting back to the leg wax that you had on February 11th, 2003, the day of your escape, you had a full leg treatment, a brow treatment, a lip treatment, a face treatment and a bikini wax; is that correct?
A. That’s incorrect. 6441

Q. Would it refresh your recollection to look at the receipt?
A. It wouldn't refresh my recollection because I know my recollection. It's solely a leg wax. If they've manipulated it, that's what they have done.
Q. The total cost was $140, correct?
A. Like I say, it was only a leg wax.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection to just look at the copy of the receipt?
A. I'm telling you, it was only a leg wax. He has the ability to choreograph everything.
Q. How about you, Ms. Arvizo?
A. No.
Q. Okay. You don't want to even look at the receipt?
A. No, because I'm telling you, it was only a leg wax.
Q. And who paid for that?
A. I paid for it. The reason is, they deducted it from the items they lost or stolen that were taken from me from the Miami trip.
Q. Who paid for your treatment at the salon?
A. I did, because that was their effort in replacing the items that were lost and stolen from the bags that I had in Miami.
Q. Did you pay the person at the salon your own money?
A. Like I said, the condition here was that 6442

1 they were deducting it from the items that they had
2 lost or stolen from me.
3 Q. Did you pay the person at the salon any
4 money?
5 A. I just answered that.
6 Q. Did you take money of your own and give it
7 to anyone at the salon on that day, Miss Arvizo?
8 A. No.
9 Q. Who did?
10 A. I don't know. I don't know. That was taken
11 care of by the Germans in the process of doing their
12 positive PR, which there was a film crew. It would
13 be good to show that.
14 Q. We'll talk about that. Okay.
15 (Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's
16 Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
17 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Frank asks you to be
18 interviewed for a documentary about Michael Jackson,
19 correct?
20 A. Correct.
21 Q. This is after your escape with Jesus,
22 correct?
23 A. Yes, it is.
24 Q. And he tells you he'd like to do a
25 documentary and would like you to say "nice
26 things" - actually, he used the word "beautiful" -
27 "about Michael," right?
28 A. This is correct. 6443

Q. And you say, “Oh, I would. That’s all I have to say.” Frank says, “You” -- and then you say, “Me and the kids, that’s all we have to say.” Correct?
A. This is correct. In this period, I only thought it was the Germans that were problems.
Q. Are you still telling the jury that everything you said nice about Michael on the rebuttal tape was from a script?
A. Yes.
Q. And if it hadn’t been for that script, you wouldn’t have said beautiful things about Michael, right?
A. Could you say that again?
Q. Are you telling the jury that when you did the rebuttal video, you and the kids, and you said nice things about Michael Jackson, you were doing it all from a script? Yes or no, Miss Arvizo.
A. Well, you lost me now.
Q. I will rephrase it.
A. Okay.
Q. In this conversation that you didn’t know was recorded --
A. Correct.
Q. -- Frank’s asking you --
A. That was illegally recorded.
Q. Thank you.
In this conversation where you are 6444

recorded --
A. Illegally.
Q. I understand your position.
A. Okay.
Q. -- you tell Frank that all you and your family had to say in a documentary are beautiful things about Michael Jackson, true?
A. Yes. That is correct.
Q. Yet, you've also told the jury that when you did the documentary, all the good things you said about Mr. Jackson were scripted, correct?
A. In the document -- in the thing, the rebuttal that they did, the whole entire thing -- I know I have a problem speaking. I'm trying to do my best.
The whole thing, from the beginning to the end, including outtakes, it was all scripted material. All of it. You didn't have to do that at this point. I would have done it on my own.
But -- prior to that, because I thought it was only the Germans.
But from the period that they did this, now this is scripted, now things have elevated. But in this, at this moment in time, yes, I would have.
But now? Have another rebuttal, and I'll speak freely. Have another audiotape with Brad Miller. I'll speak freely now.
Q. I understand. But at this point in time 6445

after your first escape, you had nothing but nice things to say about Michael Jackson?
A. That is correct. I only thought it was the Germans.
Q. And you were ready to do a documentary about Michael Jackson where all you had were beautiful things to say, correct?
A. And only if the things wouldn't have been dictated of exactly what to say. Only if. That's the only problem I had; that they want -- they wanted me to say things that were scripted, exactly what they wanted to say. Because I -- I felt what's wrong with telling the truth? And at that moment, that was the truth.
Q. And everything you said --
A. And now I know different. It was happening right underneath my nose.
Q. Miss Arvizo, everything you said on that rebuttal tape was scripted; is that what you're saying?
A. Every single thing.
Q. We will get to the rebuttal.
A. Even the outtakes.
MR. SANGER: Ready?
MR. MESEREAU: Yeah.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you complained to 6446

Frank that the Germans are trying to dictate to you
what to say, right?
A. I didn't complain. I expressed myself.
Q. Is that what you expressed to him?
A. Yes. Because they were trying to dictate to
me exactly what to say. For example, also the
charitable act. They wanted me to say that me,
Michael, my children had went to Germany and gave to
German orphans. That's what they said.
I'm not going to do that. What's wrong with
the truth at that point? I thought he was a good
guy. Now I know different.
Q. Miss Arvizo, at any time in that rebuttal
tape, did you talk about going to Germany and
dealing with orphans, per the script?
A. No. Obviously they eliminated that.
Q. Okay.
A. Or maybe I forgot. I don't know.
Q. I understand.
A. I was -- like I told you, I got in trouble
for not doing exactly what they said, so that's why
the process of leaving out of the country had to
happen.
Q. Right. I understand.
A. You're correct, I did an inadequate job.
I'm a poor actress. You're right.
Q. I think you're a good one.
MR. ZONEN: I'm going to move to object. 6447

Ask the Court to admonish counsel.
THE COURT: I'll admonish counsel not to make those remarks.
MR. MESEREAU: I will --
THE COURT: Admonish the jury to disregard such a remark.
I expect more professional behavior from you.
MR. MESEREAU: I apologize, Your Honor.
I withdraw it.
THE COURT: (To the witness) And you must only answer his questions. You're not to get into arguments with him. It's as much your fault. Do you understand that?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You said that to Frank, that what you say in the documentary has to come from the heart, right?
A. Yes. I said -- yes, I did. I said, "Think with your heart, not your head." Because our heart has a lot of pure things in there.
Q. And when you said the things you said about Michael Jackson on that rebuttal video, you were, in fact, speaking from the heart, right?
A. It was all scripted.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.) 6448

Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you said you didn't like someone named Mark Ratner, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Mark Ratner was a director on the Rush Hour movie, true?
A. Incorrect.
Q. Who was Mark Ratner?
A. I came to find out afterwards that it was Marc Schaffel.
Q. Well, you talked about Mark Ratner.
A. There is no Mark Ratner. There's only Brett Ratner.
Q. And --
A. And I hadn't --
Q. And who is Brett Ratner?
A. And I haven't spoke to Brett Ratner since my children were with Chris, since 2001. I think -- wait, 2000 -- I think it was January of 2001.
Q. Brett Ratner was the director on the Rush Hour movie, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And where did you first meet him?
A. I met him for about -- Chris had taken the children to -- that's when he was doing the filming for Rush Hour 2. It was on the set.
Q. Did you ever see him at Neverland?
A. I never saw him at Neverland.
Q. Did you ever learn that Gavin had seen him 6449

1 at Neverland?
2 A. Yes, I came to find out that afterwards.
3 Q. And did you learn that Gavin had asked him
4 to take Gavin to Florida to see Michael? Did you
5 ever learn that?
6 A. You are -- you are -- I have a lot of
7 thoughts in my heart about you.
8 But he's incorrect.
9 Q. Did you ever learn such a thing? Yes or no.
10 A. What I learned afterwards is that Brett
11 Ratner, while I was over here in Los Angeles, and
12 Dieter had cornered my son, including with Michael,
13 to have him sign a piece of paper. That's what I
14 learned while I was over here in Los Angeles.
15 Q. Did you ever learn that Gavin wanted to go
16 to Florida to see Michael, and Brett Ratner wouldn't
17 permit it?
18 A. That's incorrect.
19 Q. Okay.
20 A. Because Brett Ratner, Dieter and Michael
21 were all there in Michael's house.
22 Q. Were you there?
23 A. My children were there.
24 Q. Were you there?
25 A. I wasn't there.
26 Q. Now, you talk about the Germans keep trying
27 to push Michael Jackson to drink. Do you see that?
28 A. Yes. How foolish I was. I thought he 6450

didn’t drink. And they choreographed the little scene in front of me where they were pretending like he doesn’t drink, and he doesn’t even drink Pepsi, and I fell for that. I did. Now I know a lot of things.

Q. You complained that the Germans are trying to get Michael Jackson to drink alcohol, right?

A. Yes. Like I said, I fell for it, their little choreography. I thought he didn’t drink. They pointed out he didn’t drink an ounce of alcohol, not even Pepsi, and I fell for it. Yes, I did.

Q. When you fell for this, how many times had you stayed at Neverland?

A. This is the period before I left with Jesus. This is this period.

Q. When you fell for this, how many times had you stayed at Neverland?

A. This is the period before I left with Jesus.

Q. Okay. And did you watch the people you refer to as the Germans trying to get Michael to drink?

A. Yes. Michael was part of this choreography. Michael had pointed out that he doesn’t drink, and the Germans said he doesn’t drink and that he doesn’t even drink Pepsi. He was going, “No, no.” And now I know different. Now I know that Neverland’s all about booze, pornography and sex 6451

with boys.
MR. MESEREAU: Move to strike her comments as self-serving.
THE COURT: They're stricken. The jury is admonished to disregard those remarks.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Frank says there are evil people out there, and you agree with him, correct?
A. Yes, I believed him.
Q. Okay. And he talks about making some arrangements because you're not safe, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you thank him, correct?
A. Let me see. I'm just being appropriate.
Q. You're just being --
A. I have manners.
Q. You're just being well-mannered?
A. I'm just having manners, because as you can recall, I had left -- I believed what he had said.
MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, can I move to strike her comments?
THE WITNESS: So I went to Jay Jackson's house instead of going back.
THE COURT: Just a moment.
All right. I'll strike after she said, "I'm just having manners." 6452

Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: When you agreed with Frank that he should make arrangements because you weren't safe, you were just being well-mannered, correct?
A. At this point, I'm being only well-mannered, and I didn't agree. I was -- he was convincing me.
Q. I see. Okay. All right.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you get back on the line with Frank and he says, "How can I get in touch with you, because I know sometimes your lines are always busy."
And you say, "Yeah, it's like people are calling like crazy, you know?"
Who are you referring to?
A. This is correct. A lot of people were calling. They were interested in my son Gavin.
Q. And you were complaining to Frank about that, correct?
A. No, I'm not complaining. This is in the midst of a conversation. I didn't call him. He called me. Many times.
Q. Did you ever complain to Frank that people were calling you like crazy?
A. I stated to him -- the word here is, "Yeah, it's like people are like calling crazy, you know."
MR. MESEREAU: Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's 6453

Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Frank says to you, "I'm going need to get through to you and talk to you, because I want to get you out of there. It's -- I don't think -- I don't want you -- I don't think it's safe."
And Miss Arvizo, you respond, "It's not. It's like it's crazy. Can I read you one of the letters? It's like there are all kinds of things, and it's of no interest to me, because family never leaves family behind."
Do you see where you said that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You don't refer to any death threats at all, do you?
A. No, I don't.
Q. You say it's not safe, and you talk about all the letters you're getting. No reference to one single death threat --
A. That's because --
Q. -- is that correct, Miss Arvizo?
Just please answer my question, if you can.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay.
A. You don't have to raise your voice. I'm here listening.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
And then you say, "Family never leaves 6454

family behind, you know," right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You still consider Michael to be your family, right?
A. That's because of the initial meeting where he said --
Q. Yes or no?
A. -- "Family never leaves family behind."
Q. You still considered Michael --
A. At this point?
Q. -- to be part of your family?
A. He called himself family, and it -- basically, like I said, people 50 or over have a tender spot in my heart. Sometimes --
MR. MESEREAU: May I object to the colloquy? Move to strike.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Do you want to read the question back? Read the question to her.
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: I considered him to be like family.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Frank says to you, Ms. Arvizo, "For your safety, and if we were to put a secur -- maybe have somebody 24 hours outside your 6455

house, protecting your house from people, would you mind if we do that?" And your answer is, "No." Right?
A. My answer is, "No," I don't want that.
MR. MESEREAU: Keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Ms. Arvizo, after Frank says, "Maybe have somebody 24 hours outside your house, protecting your house from people, would you mind if you do that?" And you say, "No," you then talk about how your children's school is bombarded; correct?
A. Yes, this is because Michael and the Germans had told me that.
Q. Well, you didn't say that now, did you?
A. I did say that.
Q. You're in Los Angeles when you make this comment, aren't you?
A. No, it's correct. I'm telling you -- you want to know the information. You weren't there; I was. Michael and the Germans had told me that.
MR. MESEREAU: May I ask -- would the Court instruct the witness just to respond to my question?
THE WITNESS: I am responding.
THE COURT: You must listen to the question and answer the question, and not try to advance beyond the question. 6456

THE WITNESS: Okay.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You say to Frank, “So I have my kids here, and the school is completely cooperating with giving, like, me to work.” He says, “Okay.” And you say, “My children’s school is like bombarded,” correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. Frank goes, “I know,” right?
A. That’s correct.
Q. Then you say, “I didn’t go to the other apartment. It’s like crazy over there,” correct?
A. This is correct.
MR. MESEREAU: Let’s keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff’s Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You then tell Frank about the apartment in East Los Angeles, correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. You tell him it’s on North Soto Street, right?
A. That’s right.
Q. And after telling him that your children’s school is, like, bombarded, and that the other apartment, it’s like crazy over there, you tell him that you didn’t go to Soto Street. You went straight to your mom’s house, true?
A. This is -- this is correct. I told him I came straight here to my mom’s house from Neverland, 6457

to my mom's house, because I believed what the Germans and Michael had said.
Q. Okay.
A. And I'm repeating what they said --
Q. I see.
A. -- to Frank.
Q. That's your explanation for those comments, correct?
A. This is -- this is accurate information.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay. Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Miss Arvizo, after talking about how your children's school is bombarded, and it's crazy over at Soto Street, and that you've gone to your mom's house and didn't go to Soto Street, Frank says to you, "What if we were to take you to a church up there? Because it's just really important. You're going to have to have somebody stay outside your house and watch you, your house, protect and make sure nobody comes to your house. Oh, I want to take you up to the ranch just for your safety and your family."
And your response to that statement is, "Do you have a cell number, Frank?" And he says, "Yes."
At no time do you say you don't want any of that protection, do you?
A. At no time does it say a "Yes." 6458

Q. Your response to his statement about giving you protection is, “Can I have your cell number?” Right?
A. I just said, “Do you have” -- and prior to that, you said something about church. I have never missed Ash Wednesday. Never.
MR. MESEREAU: Objection; move to strike.
THE WITNESS: And when I was in Neverland, they didn’t take me to church. I missed Ash Wednesday.
THE COURT: Just a moment.
I will strike that, those remarks. But, Counsel, your question was so long and lengthy, one wonders what one should comment on in it.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay.
THE COURT: And I’ll ask you to refrain from that type of question. It’s causing problems here.
MR. MESEREAU: Yes. I’ll rephrase it, Your Honor.
Q. Miss Arvizo, referring you to Frank Cascio’s statement, it begins with “What if we were...,” do you see that?
A. Okay.
Q. He says to you, “What if we were to take you to a church up there,” right?
A. That’s correct.
Q. “Because it’s just really important,” right?
A. Uh-huh. 6459

Q. And it says -- it says, “Inaudible,” right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then he says, “You’re going to have to take somebody” -- excuse me. “You’re going to have to have somebody stay outside your house and watch you,” right?
A. Correct.
Q. He says, “Your house,” right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Then he says, “Protect and make sure nobody comes to your house,” right?
A. Correct.
Q. “Oh, I want to take you up to the ranch just for your safety and your family.” Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And your response to that is, “Do you have a cell number, Frank?” Right?
A. That’s it.
Q. And he says, “Yes.”
A. And it’s not --
Q. Right?
A. And it’s not a “yes” from me.
Q. And it’s not a “no” either, is it?
MR. ZONEN: It’s argumentative; objection.
THE WITNESS: He’s convincing me.
THE COURT: Excuse me, Counsel?
MR. MESEREAU: Objection; argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained. 6460

MR. MESEREAU: Let's keep going.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Going further into this taped phone conversation --
A. And notifying that there's also numerous tape breaks.
Q. I understand.
You say to Frank, "Is there a way I can get back to you, Frank?" Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that. I'm being polite.
Q. I understand.
And Frank --
A. Because I not once - and when you see those subpoenaed phone records - called him back during this period.
Q. And you say, "Call you" --
Your Honor, may I move to strike the witness's comments?
THE COURT: I'm not going to strike it. The last question listed is you just saying, "I understand," and then she starts talking. So there was no question and --
MR. MESEREAU: Okay.
Q. Miss Arvizo, you say to Frank, "Is there a way I can get back to you, Frank?" Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Frank says, "Call you if there is an 6461

1 emergency," right?
2 A. Correct. And there's also a tape break.
3 Q. Yes. And then you say, "Okay, I have no
4 control (another phone is heard ringing) Frank.
5 People call and call. So when they call, it sounds
6 busy to whoever else. " Do you see that?
7 A. This is correct.
8 Q. Frank says, "Okay." And then you say, "This
9 is my mom's number."
10 A. Yes, I was at my mother's house.
11 Q. You gave Frank your mom's phone number,
12 true?
13 A. I gave Frank my mom's phone number? No.
14 Q. All right.
15 A. He himself had it.
16 Q. Okay.
17 (Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's
18 Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
19 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You said to Frank, "Don't
20 worry, Frank, we're a family, okay?" Do you see
21 that?
22 A. Oh, I see it right here.
23 Q. Frank says, "Okay." Do you see that?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. You say, "Michael's family to me." Then
26 it's inaudible. "My kids call him Daddy Michael."
27 Do you see that?
28 A. That's correct. This is correct. 6462

Q. Then he says, “But -- but Janet, you understand like how we have to protect you and Michael, Gavin and your kids. That’s why I’m so concerned.” Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you respond to Frank, “That’s why the German people said, ‘You need no protection. You’re nobody’ --
A. Yes.
Q. -- “you know?”
And you say -- and Frank says, “No, that’s not true,” correct?
A. Correct. Do you want me --
Q. I’d like to ask you just some questions, if I can, all right?
A. Okay. Sure.
Q. You complain to Frank that the German people said you didn’t need protection, because you’re a nobody, right?
A. No. It’s -- it says, “That’s why the German people say, “I need no protection. You’re nobody,’ you know?”
Q. And then Frank then responds, “No, that’s not true,” correct?
A. Correct. Correct. But do you want information on this statement?
Q. Did the German people tell you you don’t need protection, you’re a nobody? 6463

A. Yes, they sure did.
Q. We'll move further on.
A. When they had me sign the paper --
Q. Correct?
A. Oh, then he doesn't want you to know.
THE COURT: Just a moment. Just a moment.
Listen to the question and answer it. You're going
beyond the question. I've asked you not to do that.
THE WITNESS: Okay. This is just so hard,
Judge. For two years I've been waiting.
THE COURT: I'll strike that remark.
Go ahead, Counsel.
MR. MESEREAU: Let's go.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's
Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
THE COURT: Counsel? I'm sorry to break your
concentration, but I want to explain something to
the jury.
MR. MESEREAU: Sure.
THE COURT: If you need to start over on
that, you can.
(To the jury) During the course of this
trial, quite often I have said, "I'll strike that."
The purpose in doing that is twofold: One is to
tell you you're not to consider that, whether it's
testimony, whether it's remarks by an attorney,
whether it's remarks by a witness. And it also is
reflected in the record. 6464

Later, when you're deciding this case and you're in the jury room, you may want to have testimony read back. And when testimony is read back to you, you don't -- that's not there. It is stricken at that time, so the court reporter reads it to you, she sees that it's stricken, she doesn't read all of that to you.

So it may seem strange that I just say "Strike that." But what it really means always is, if I say "strike it," don't consider it. Don't discuss it in your deliberations. It's sort of like asking you to unring a bell that you've heard ring, but as intellects, we are -- you know, we are capable of deciding the case on information that's admissible and not on information that's not admissible, right?

Everybody on the jury understand that?

THE JURY: (In unison) (Nods head up and down.)

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MESEREAU: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you want to -- since I interrupted you, did you want to play that section back, or are you okay?

MR. MESEREAU: I think we're okay, Your Honor. Appreciate it. Thank you.

Q. Miss Arvizo, you constantly complain about the German people in this conversation, right? 6465

A. This is correct.
Q. And going back to the portion that we just played, Frank tells you the following: “No, don’t. Listen, ah, you don’t have to talk to them. Just talk to me, talk to Michael, and I’m going to arrange everything. But it’s either we’re going to have to have somebody at your house this weekend or we’re going to have to take you to the ranch. This way Michael -- Michael wants to see you. He’s -- he was almost -- he didn’t know what happened. He thought he did something and he was trying to get in touch with you. And I said, ‘Don’t worry, I’ll take care of this.’ So --”
And your response to that statement is, “Tell him he’s our family,” right?
A. That is correct.
Q. You never object to having security at your house, as Frank proposes, right?
A. I didn’t -- I never said “Yes.”
Q. Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff’s Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Going further, you keep complaining about the German people.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Frank says to you, “You don’t have to talk to them,” right?
A. Correct. 6466

Q. You say, “I thought like everything, my family was in jeopardy,” correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. Frank responds, “No,” right?
A. Yes.
Q. And your response to that is, “Meaning us being with Michael and Michael being with us, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What you said to Frank was you were concerned about your family not being with Michael and Michael being with your family, true?
A. I said, “I thought like everything, my family, was in jeopardy.”
Q. And then you say, “Meaning us being with Michael and Michael being with us”?
A. Yes. I will never say no to love.
MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Objection to her -- move to strike the remarks.
THE COURT: I’m sorry, I don’t understand the question or the answer.
Would you just ask another question?
MR. MESEREAU: I’ll ask another question, yes, Your Honor.
Q. Frank says, “You don’t have to talk to the German people,” and you say to him, “I thought like everything, my family, was in jeopardy,” right?
A. Yes. 6467

Q. And then you say, “Meaning us being with Michael and Michael being with us,” correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. After your escape with Jesus, you still want Michael to be with your family, and your family to be with him, true?
A. Yes. I thought it was all --
MR. MESEREAU: Objection, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: I believed what he said in Miami.
THE COURT: Just a moment.
All right. Go ahead with your next question.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff’s Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Going further into this tape, okay?
A. With the numerous tape breaks.
Q. I understand. Now, Frank says, “We need to protect you and your family, so I’ll call you in one hour to see if you’re okay,” right?
A. Okay. Did you go farther up, higher, or --
Q. Well, let’s see, the pages aren’t numbered. So it starts at -- the top of the page starts with, “…to do in a couple of hours….” Do you see that?
A. Okay, this is from this previous page.
Q. Do you see that? 6468

A. And then on top. Okay. Okay.
Q. Yes. The first full quote from Frank Cascio on that page, okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Frank says, “I’m going to call you just to see how you’re doing, because we need to protect you and your family. So I’ll call you in one hour to see if you’re okay.” And you say, “Okay,” right?
A. Uh-huh. This is correct, being polite.
Q. At no time do you disagree with the continually repeated idea that your family needs some protection, right?
A. And at no time do I request it.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff’s Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You tell Frank you’re at your mom’s house. He says to you, “This is the number to your mom’s house,” question mark, and you say “Yeah,” correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. Are you still telling the jury you never wanted Frank to have the number to your mom’s house?
A. He’s calling at my mom’s house. He asked me, “Is this your mom’s house?” I never gave it to him. He already had it.
Q. Okay.
A. I’m at my mom’s house.
Q. And you have no idea how Frank got the 6469

number to your mom's house, true?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, going back a little bit --
A. Oh, yeah, now I know how.
Q. I understand.
Going back a little bit, "I told them when
people neglected us, rejected us, they don't
know...," and then there's a tape break. It says,
"Um, Baby Rubba."
What were you referring to when you said,
"People neglected us and rejected us"?
A. My husband, my ex-husband David Arvizo, with
his family.
Q. Were you referring to anyone else?
A. No. Nobody else.
Q. Do you remember in the rebuttal video where
you accused the Department of Children & Family
Services of neglecting your family?
A. Maybe it was -- maybe it was put in another
context, but that's what I meant. My ex in-laws.
Q. They're the only people you're referring to,
right?
A. That's exactly right.
Q. Okay. Now, in that rebuttal tape, you also
talk about your family being spit on and
discriminated against and things like that, correct?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And are you only referring to David's family 6470

when you say that?
A. Part of it is David's family. And David.
Mostly David.
Q. And who's the rest of it?
A. Mostly David, his family. And just
different things like that. Different experiences.
Q. But in that tape you talk about more people
than David and his family.
A. Are we talking about this tape or --
Q. I'm asking about the rebuttal tape now,
okay?
A. Okay.
Q. You talk about -- excuse me, in that tape,
you say words to the effect, "We've been spit on,
we've been fried, we've been rejected because of our
race," and a whole bunch of things, right? You're
not referring to David's family when you say that?
A. Are you missing the point that it was all
scripted?
Q. I'm asking you a question, Miss Arvizo.
Could you please answer it?
A. Okay. Remember in the initial meeting in
Miami how I was just telling everything about -- to
the Germans? Well, obviously they were in the works
in doing the script since back then.
Q. So when you say words to that effect in this
conversation --
A. This conversation. 6471

Q. -- the Brad Miller interview and the rebuttal video, you're only referring to David's family?
A. Brad Miller audiotape and this is referring to David's -- David mostly, with his family. But in the rebuttal, like I said, it was all scripted. All of it. It was the information that they had extracted from me and my children. And it's pretty obvious that it's very ingrained, the experiences that I have felt and gone through with my ex family, which is David's family.
Q. Okay.
A. And they put it in with their little script.
Q. Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 809, was played for the Court and jury to its conclusion.)
MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, I think that completes the recording of the phone conversation.
THE COURT: Okay.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Miss Arvizo, you filed for divorce from David approximately five days after you settled the J.C. Penney case, correct?
A. I filed for divorce after David was arrested for domestic violence.
MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, may I ask the Court to instruct the witness to answer the question? 6472

THE WITNESS: Well, your question was about --
THE COURT: Just a moment.
Would you read the question back to the witness?
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: I don't know about that. He wanted a history as far as when, and I'm telling you, I filed for divorce the day after -- not the day after, but after David finally was arrested for domestic violence.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: In your case against David for domestic violence, you told the Los Angeles Police Department that he had been abusing you for many years, true?
A. This is correct.
Q. You told the Los Angeles Police Department that he had been abusing you since you were married, correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. Had David been abusing you from the time you were married?
A. This is correct.
Q. You told the Los Angeles Police Department that for approximately 17 years, he had been physically and emotionally abusing you, right?
A. This is correct.
Q. You also said he had been abusing your 6473

children for the entire marriage, correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. But in the J.C. Penney case, when you wanted money, you said the opposite about David, didn't you?
A. That's incorrect. When David was arrested, I went to Rothstein's office, who was in charge of the civil -- civil proceedings, of the civil J.C. Penney's lawsuit, and I told him David has finally been arrested. I want to correct this statement that me and my children were unable to say because he was still part of our life.
And I went to their office, and they told me that they would take care of it. And that's why when the police asked me to waive this information of my civil lawsuit, I did happily. And yet these Rothstein people did not do that. I told them to inform J.C. Penney's and Tower Records that that information was incorrect right after David was arrested. I finally was liberated to say what actually had been going on for years.
Q. Miss Arvizo --
A. So you're inaccurate.
Q. Well, Miss Arvizo, do you remember having your sworn deposition taken in the J.C. Penney case?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was a case that you had filed claiming you were sexually abused by J.C. Penney by 6474

1 the security guards in a public parking lot,
2 correct?
3 A. I gave the civil lawyers the information
4 about what happened, just as I told the police
5 department, the West Covina Police Department.
6 Now, how they write their statement, how
7 they do these paperworks, I don't know. But it's
8 only one story. And it's been repeated over and
9 over. How they put it in this paperwork, I don't
10 know. I wasn't the attorney.
11 Q. Miss Arvizo, you gave a sworn deposition in
12 that case where you were placed under oath, correct?
13 A. This is correct.
14 Q. And you filed a claim for monetary damages
15 against J.C. Penney, correct?
16 A. This is correct.
17 Q. You were claiming that you had suffered
18 physical injury because of what J.C. Penney security
19 guards did to you, correct?
20 A. Tower Records.
21 Q. Correct?
22 A. This is correct.
23 Q. And to prove your claim for monetary
24 damages, you had to explain that your physical
25 injuries were solely the result of what J.C. Penney
26 and Tower Records had done to you, correct?
27 A. This is correct. And they had me explain,
28 to the millisecond, of the process while I was being 6475

1 hurt.
2 Q. Your deposition was taken on December 18th,
3 the year 2000, correct?
4 A. Yes, while I was still married and David was
5 with me and my children. Yes, that's correct.
6 Q. And what year did you file for divorce from
7 David?
8 A. Approximately in 2001. When David was
9 arrested.
10 Q. And on December 18th, the year 2000, you
11 were asked under oath, "Has David Arvizo ever struck
12 you," and you said, "No."
13 A. This is correct.
14 Q. You were asked under oath, "Has David ever
15 struck your children?" You said, "No. We goof
16 around a lot, though, play." Correct?
17 A. Yes. This is correct.
18 Q. You were not telling the truth under oath
19 when you made those statements, correct?
20 A. But prior to settlement, I had went to
21 the -- to Rothstein's office and I requested that
22 they fix that, after David was arrested, because I
23 finally could open my mouth. And this -- I want you
24 to have a picture of this.
25 MR. MESEREAU: Move to strike, Your Honor.
26 THE WITNESS: This is when Gavin is going
27 through chemotherapy.
28 THE COURT: Just a moment. Just a moment. 6476

I'll strike her answer to that.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Further in that deposition --
THE COURT: Just a moment.
MR. MESEREAU: Oh, I'm sorry. Pardon me.
THE COURT: Do you want to go back to the question you asked? The answer has been stricken.
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, if we could have it read back, Your Honor, I'd appreciate it.
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: This is correct.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Further, in that deposition, you were asked, "Have you had any marital problems at all other than related to this incident at J.C. Penney?" And you said "No." Right?
A. This is correct. I was -- by the time that David had gotten arrested, I was never going to tell anything that he had done to me or my kids. Never.
Q. You lied under oath to increase the amount of money you could get from what you claimed J.C. Penney and Tower had done to you, right?
MR. ZONEN: Objection; argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, in that deposition, you were asked when you decided to file a lawsuit, correct?
A. Correct. 6477

Q. You said you decided to file a lawsuit against J.C. Penney and Tower Records two weeks or two or three weeks prior to the expiration date. Remember that?
A. I don't understand what your question is.
Q. Well, I'm just going to ask you about your answer. And I can show you the page, if you want to see it.
A. No, I just don't understand your question. I don't know whether you're making a statement or an actual question.
Q. Then that's my mistake. I'll rephrase it.
A. Okay. That's okay.
Q. In your deposition under oath, in the J.C. Penney case, you were asked the question, "When did you decide to file a lawsuit?" Do you remember that?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And your answer was, "Two weeks or two or three weeks prior to the expiration date."
A. This is correct. If it's on there, it is correct.
Q. Then you were asked, "Was that before or after the criminal charges had been dropped?" Remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said, "Way after," correct?
A. Yes. 6478

Q. When you used the words “expiration date,” you were referring to the deadline that you had to file charges -- excuse me, file a lawsuit before, correct?
A. That’s what I was explained.
Q. You would lose your right to file a civil suit if you didn’t file it by a certain date, correct?
A. That’s what I was explained by the civil attorneys.
Q. And --
A. If there’s anything that sounds worth -- worth of any intelligence there, that’s what I was informed. No credit to me. Only to the civil attorneys.
Q. Well, you knew enough to say under oath that you filed your civil case before the deadline, right?
A. Because of attorneys had made me aware of that.
Q. Are you aware of the deadlines that you or your children have to file claims against Mr. Jackson?
A. We will never file a claim against Mr. Jackson. I want justice here.
Q. Are you aware, Ms. Arvizo, of the deadlines you have to file a civil claim against Mr. Jackson? Yes or no. 6479

A. I think so. I'm not interested, so I don't ask.
Q. I understand. And in this case you weren't interested until after the criminal investigation was over, correct?
A. I wanted an apology.
MR. ZONEN: Which case is counsel referring to? Vague.
MR. MESEREAU: I will rephrase it. The prosecutor is correct.
Q. In the J.C. Penney case, you waited till after a criminal investigation was over to file your civil claims, true?
A. I wanted an apology.
Q. You wanted over $100,000, didn't you?
A. I didn't get over $100,000.
Q. You got 152,000 in the settlement, Miss Arvizo, didn't you?
A. In -- in my hand, I did not get $150,000.
MR. MESEREAU: May I ask the witness be instructed --
MR. ZONEN: I think she just answered.
THE WITNESS: I answered.
THE COURT: It was -- your question, your last question, was basically whether she got a certain amount, and she's trying to answer that.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: The settlement to you and -- 6480

THE COURT: Just a minute. Let her finish the answer.
THE WITNESS: In my hand, I received only $32,000. That's it. In my hand. And that's my best approximation.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Miss Arvizo, what did Gavin get in his hand from that settlement?
A. I don't remember, because it's been put away where it's to be untouched by me.
Q. What did Star get in his hand in that settlement?
A. Still nothing. I don't know, because it's -- it's something that's untouched by me. It's for them.
Q. What did David get in his hand from that settlement?
A. That's -- you're going to have to ask David, and yet he was not injured whatsoever.
Q. The total was over $152,000 that your family was given in the settlement, true?
A. That you have to ask my civil attorneys. And I think his statement may be correct.
Q. Okay. You claimed in that case that you had bruises from what the security guards did to you, right?
A. It is correct.
Q. After you had resolved that case and obtained money, you claimed that you were bruised by 6481

David, true?
A. I had always been bruised by David for 3 years. But I never told anyone until after David was arrested. That was the pivotal point in my life. Not until David was arrested did I say anything about bruises in my whole entire life, and that was only with people of authority. That's it.
Q. When you were seeking money from J.C. Penney and Tower Records, you testified under oath on December 18th, the year 2000, that you never had any black and blue marks prior to the incident at J.C. Penney, correct?
A. Yes, this is correct. I was too embarrassed to ever tell anyone.
Q. You made that statement because you wanted any injury you ever had to be attributed to J.C. Penney and Tower Records, right?
A. Incorrect. What J.C. Penney's and Tower Records did to me was one day, one situation, one incident. That's it.
Q. If you had testified truthfully under oath and said that your bruises were from David, the amount of monetary damages you could get from J.C. Penney would have been lowered, true?
A. This is incorrect. I would have never told anyone until David got arrested that I -- that David was giving me these bruises. Never. People would see me with bruises and I would never, never, never 6482

tell them.
Q. Did you lie under oath in your deposition in the J.C. Penney case?
A. I tried to remedy that when I had gone to my -- after David was arrested, I went to Rothstein's office. And I requested that they inform Tower Records and J.C. Penney's that I would like to make that correct statement because the statements that were there were incorrect. But finally me and my kids could finally say what was really happening for many, many years.
Q. Mrs. Arvizo, the problem you had was that when you made allegations later on against David that he had abused you for 17 years, there was a deposition that had previously been taken where you said the opposite under oath, right?
A. You're -- it's too long. There's a yes and no and yes and no, and now I don't know.
THE COURT: Let's take a break.
(Recess taken.)
THE COURT: Mr. Mesereau?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
Q. Miss Arvizo --
THE BAILIFF: You need to turn your microphone on, please.
MR. MESEREAU: Oh, thank you.
THE COURT: You missed a good show of hands there. 6483

Give it to him again, would you?
Look, look, look.
(Laughter.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Miss Arvizo, did you tell the jury that David was not honest in the J.C. Penney case?
A. Me?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. Ask the question again.
Q. I'll rephrase it. Did you tell the jury words to the effect that your ex-husband David did not tell the truth in the J.C. Penney case?
A. Are we talking about the grand jury or the civil lawsuit?
Q. The civil lawsuit.
A. Did I tell a jury?
Q. Did you tell this jury today that David did not tell the truth in the J.C. Penney civil suit?
A. We weren't talking about David. I was telling you what I -- David had done to me and the children.
Q. David sued J.C. Penney with you, correct?
A. This is correct.
Q. David claimed he was injured in that parking lot with you and your children, correct?
A. To my -- what I was aware of is that he wasn't injured. And that's it.
Q. But he was suing, with you, for monetary 6484

damages for being injured, right?
A. I came afterwards. David -- when I walked up to the situation, he was being hit by these people. So I don't know what happened prior to me arriving there. So I'm unaware.
Q. During the time you had your deposition taken in the J.C. Penney lawsuit --
A. Yes.
Q. -- did you consider David to be an honest person?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember testifying under oath in the J.C. Penney lawsuit that, "David is extremely honest. He's too honest"?
A. If that's on there, then that's correct. Whatever's on the deposition is correct.
Q. Do you remember saying that under oath?
A. If it's on there, then it is.
Q. Would it refresh if I just show it to you?
A. I'm just asking, if it is on there, it's correct.
Q. Okay. I have to get a response from you as to whether you said that or not, okay?
A. If it's on there, it's correct. And it would be a yes, if it's on there.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection just to show it to you first? Would that help?
A. It's a yes. 6485

Q. Your answer is “yes”?
A. Yes.
Q. You did say under oath that, “David is extremely honest. He’s too honest”?
A. Yes.
Q. And you weren’t telling the truth when you made that statement under oath, correct?
A. Anything to do with David, no. That’s why I went to the civil attorneys, to try to correct that after he was arrested.
Q. Let me get this straight, now. You went to the civil attorneys to try and change your testimony after you collected a settlement?
A. Incorrect. The settlement still had not been corrected, accepted or settled. Anything like that. It was still prior.
Q. Now, you claimed you were assaulted in a public parking lot by J.C. Penney security guards, correct?
A. Plus Tower Records.
Q. And Tower Records, right?
A. That’s right.
Q. You said you thought you were going to die, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you think you were going to die in a public parking lot when you were assaulted by these security guards? 6486

A. Yes, I did, because it came to a point where I couldn't breathe.
Q. Okay. You testified the security guards were doing belly flops on top of your body, right?
A. That's what I was told.
MR. ZONEN: I'll object as beyond the scope of the 402 hearing.
THE COURT: The objection is overruled. Do you want to read the question back to her?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, please, Your Honor. Thank you.
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: This is correct.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And you also claimed that security guards in a public parking lot pulled your breasts out of your blouse and squeezed your nipple between 10 to 25 times, correct?
A. No, they didn't pull my breasts out.
Q. What did you claim happened?
A. In the course of me getting beat up, I was laying flat on the floor. My breasts had came out of my bra.
Q. Did you testify under oath that your nipple was squeezed by one of the guards 10 to 25 times?
A. At this moment, the attorney, who was the defense attorney, wanted me to describe everything by the millisecond, even though, in my depositions, 6487

I keep saying, over and over, “It was like this. It was like this.” And instead, he wanted me to go millisecond per millisecond, so I described it the best I could as it was happening. But if you fast-forward, that would have been fast.

Q. And how did you describe the sexual assault?

A. Like I said, the wording as far as how the civil attorneys did, that was their choice of words. There was only one, how I described it, and that’s how they put it in.

Q. Please tell the jury how you were sexually assaulted.

A. Well, to me - me - I feel that my breast area and anything to do with my -- with down there, my private area, is considered my sexual organs. That’s how I see it and how I feel about it. So if you place your hands on me in that area, I’m going to say that.

Q. And please tell the jury how you were sexually assaulted in that public parking lot.

A. Okay. When I was laying on the floor, while they’re beating on me, one of the Tower Records guys, who incidentally -- this can be verified. I think he was also fired for doing this to some other people after this, so -- but this person, while I was laying on the floor getting beat up, he had his hand over and over on my breast and on the front area of my private area. My pants were on. There 6488

was no intercourse, no rape, no nothing like that.
I was just trying to describe that his hands were on
my breasts, which I think I repeatedly kept saying I
just wanted his hands off of me, and that's it.
Q. Do you remember testifying your nipple was
squeezed 10 to 25 times?
A. Yes. Again, it was he wanted me -- to
humiliate me, like he's trying to do at this moment,
and making me to say it millisecond per millisecond.
Q. You testified to these facts to get money,
true?
A. It was a civil lawsuit, yes, it was.
Q. Now, you claim in that lawsuit that Gavin's
cancer was made worse by the security guards, true?
A. I don't think so. I think -- I think I said
something that Gavin was having the chemotherapy at
this time when they wanted the deposition to occur.
Q. You also claim that Star's cyst was made
worse by the security guards, correct?
A. Incorrect.
Q. Did you ever make such a claim?
A. Incorrect.
Q. What did you say about Star in that
situation?
A. I think -- and this is the best I can
remember, and we're talking 1998 here when this
happened. This is the best I can try to remember.
He's got a big, giant book right there, and I have 6489

nothing in front of me.
And, let me see, I think what happened was when we went to the doctors, they did -- they put him in this tube, and when it came out, they ended up telling me that Star has a cyst on his brain, but this is something that is -- that Star has. That's it. Has nothing to do with J.C. Penney's lawsuit. I'm -- of course, getting hit on the head doesn't help if you've got a cyst on your brain.
Q. Do you know someone named Mary Holzer?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Please tell the jury who Mary Holzer is.
A. Mary Holzer is a giant Michael Jackson fan. And she's also a -- an office manager. This is my understanding. She told me she was an office manager for Rothstein civil law -- civil law firm.
Q. And who is the Rothstein civil law firm?
A. The Rothstein civil law firm is a firm that was responsible for the lawsuit.
Q. Do you remember, after you had settled that case, telling Mary Holzer that you lied in the case?
A. That is inaccurate.
Q. Okay. Do you remember telling Mary Holzer that David's brother is in the Mexican mafia?
A. That's incorrect.
Q. And that he sells drugs here and in Las Vegas?
A. That's incorrect. 6490

Q. You said, “He’s going to come after you and your daughter if you ever tell anyone what I’m revealing to you”?
A. Incorrect.
Q. Okay. So that never happened, right?
A. That never happened.
Q. And if Mary Holzer comes into court and says that, she’d be lying; is that correct?
MR. ZONEN: Objection; argumentative.
THE WITNESS: Yes, she would. Yes, she would.
THE COURT: Just a moment.
The objection to the question is sustained.
The question and answer are stricken.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: How many lies under oath do you think you told in your depositions in the J.C. Penney case?
A. Like I said, I tried -- after David was arrested, I went to the Rothstein office and I pointed out to them, prior to a settlement agreement, that I would like to correct the statements that were inaccurate, because finally David was arrested. Finally, we and my children could speak. And Rothstein, including with Mary Holzer, said, “Don’t worry. We’ll take care of it.” And they didn’t. So I considered their firm a -- liars.
Q. But not you, right? 6491

A. That's correct.
MR. ZONEN: Objection; argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained. The remark's stricken.
You're admonished not to make those remarks.
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor.
Q. You testified in that deposition in the J.C. Penney case that you had worked as an undercover agent. Do you remember that?
A. Me?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you --
A. I don't think the way you're using it is correct.
Q. Remember you said you had worked in internal security?
A. What he's trying to say, he's trying to make it bigger than it is. I used to be a loss prevention agent way back in -- I think it was 1990. We're talking about 15 years ago. That's my best estimate. I used to work at Von's. Just, you know, people that took an orange, took a banana, things like that.
Q. Remember you were asked the question, "And you were an undercover type of agent?" And you answered, "Yes"?
A. Yes. That's what they called it. It was 6492

loss prevention agent. You wore plain clothes and you stopped people when they take items without purchasing them from the market, from Von's market.
A grocery store.
Q. How long did you work in that capacity?
A. I think I worked there for -- my best estimate, best estimate, maybe - this was about 15 years ago - maybe about one year. Maybe. My best estimate. This is having to recall 15 years ago. Please, this is an approximation of dates.
Q. You testified in that case that security agents in the public parking lot punched you, correct?
MR. ZONEN: Which case are we talking about? Von's?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. MESEREAU: J.C. Penney case. Was there a case against Von's?
I haven't have said that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You're right, you shouldn't have.
The District Attorney, you're admonished to object according to the legal standards for objections.
MR. ZONEN: The objection is vague, then, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's a little late.
I'm not going to allow you to engage in that 6493

type of conversation with each other or with the witness.
MR. MESEREAU: I apologize.
THE COURT: Do you want me to shut the trial down this afternoon?
MR. MESEREAU: No, Your Honor, I don't.
THE COURT: Then let's start taking this seriously and act correctly.
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: In the J.C. Penney case, you claimed under oath that you were punched with closed fists in the parking lot of J.C. Penney, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You also claim that you were punched with handcuffs, like they were brass knuckles, correct?
A. Read -- what are you talking about? If I said that I was beat up, that includes everything they did.
You know, he wants me to recall something that happened in 1998 and break it down while he's got a big, giant book right here.
Q. In the J.C. Penney case, did you claim under oath that you were punched with handcuffs as if they were brass knuckles?
A. I remember -- I remember seeing the female having the handcuffs inside her fingers like this. 6494

That's what I remember seeing.
Q. And after being punched all these times in the parking lot, you said you thought you were going to die and it was like you were in a cave in a tunnel. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, it did feel that way. It did feel that way.
Q. You said security guards were punching Gavin and Star, correct?
A. Can you please read -- bring me that where it says that?
Q. Okay.
A. Because my son -- both of my sons were hurt.
Q. Were they hurt by security guards?
A. No, bring me --
Q. Were they hurt by security guards?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Okay. You said Gavin didn't get up. He just laid on the floor, right?
A. I think -- he's being general. My son was pushed and -- by one of them, causing his elbow to fracture. He ended up having a fracture, so --
Q. And you said Gavin had cancer in both his lungs, right?
A. Now, are we going at that time?
Q. Yes, at that time.
A. Okay. He's mixing up the facts purposely. When my son was deposed in 2000, he had 6495

cancer. And they had -- progressively it went to both of his lungs. At that time when both my boys -- the summer of first grade when this happened with J.C. Penney's, no, he did not have cancer. But when he was deposed, yes, he did.
Q. And he had cancer in both of his lungs at that point, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Stage IV.
Q. Do you know an attorney named George Owen Feldman?
A. No, I don't know him.
Q. Has George Owen Feldman ever represented you, to your knowledge?
A. Never.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection if I just showed you a document you signed with his name on it?
A. Sure. Go ahead.
MR. MESEREAU: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. And I think that's something that your office, Mr. -- Mr. Sneddon's office --
THE COURT: Just a minute. There's no question pending.
THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. I was ready to -- 6496

THE COURT: Just a moment.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel.
MR. MESEREAU: Okay.
Q. Have you had a chance to look at that document?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Does it refresh your recollection about who George Owen Feldman is?
A. I've never been represented by George Owen Feldman, but I understand what he's trying to say, the paperwork.
Q. So you never have been represented by that lawyer, right?
A. Never.
MR. ZONEN: Objection; asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: Never.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Do you remember testifying under oath in the J.C. Penney deposition that you weren't interested in suing?
A. I wanted an apology.
Q. Did you ever withdraw your suit for money?
A. No.
Q. Are you telling the jury that you blame your descriptions of what happened to you on your attorneys?
A. What? 6497

Q. Are you telling this jury that you blame the way you describe your injuries in that case on your lawyers?
A. No. Like -- I'm going to try to make out what he's trying to say. However I spoke to them and however they communicated to the court, that's how it was.
Q. Did you testify under oath the way your lawyers told you to? Is that what you're saying?
A. What?
Q. Did you testify under oath in that deposition the way your lawyers told you to?
A. No.
Q. Are you blaming your descriptions about what happened to you in the parking lot on your lawyers?
MR. ZONEN: Objection. Vague as to "descriptions."
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to try -- I'm trying to feel for what he's asking.
How I communicate -- communicated to him, to them, is once. As I told the police, I told them.
Now, what they -- how they put it on paper, I have no control of that. He was not -- I wasn't one of the knights of the round table sitting there and coming up with proper words what to say.
That's it. One story. That's it. The same one I 6498

told to the police.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: When did you meet Michael Jackson?
A. I think it was, my best estimate, August of 2000.
Q. Do you remember signing a document prepared by the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department on December 18th, 2003?
A. Okay, I think -- is it the paper you just showed me?
Q. Yes. But I have a --
A. I can't answer unless you tell me exactly. You know, there was a lot of paperwork.
Q. Would you like to see it?
A. Well, I'm asking you, please, is it the same one that you just came up here and showed me?
Q. It is.
A. Okay. Then, yes. I've signed many paperworks of theirs.
Q. Let me ask you the question again.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recall signing a document prepared by the Sheriff's Department of Santa Barbara County on December 18th, 2003?
A. I think so.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection just to look at the date and your signature?
A. No. That's -- is that the one that you just 6499

showed me?
Q. It is.
A. Then -- then, yes.
Q. You did sign that document --
A. Yes.
Q. -- on December 18th --
A. Yes.
Q. -- 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, do you remember signing a document prepared by the sheriff's department that said the following: "From time to time, between January 1st, 2000, and the present date, I consulted one or more of those lawyers concerning Michael Jackson's interaction with me and my children at Neverland Ranch in Santa Barbara County and elsewhere, in this and other states, and concerning the return of some furniture stored by or in the name of Brad Miller at Dino's Storage in North Hollywood, Los Angeles County."
Do you remember signing a document that had those words?
A. Do you want me to have the document, like -- we've had this discussion over since August.
MR. MESEREAU: Object, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Since August, the same thing --
THE COURT: Just a moment. I want you to

answer the question. The question is, do you remember signing that document?
THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And the document said that you had started investigating Michael Jackson sometime between January 1st, 2000, and the date you signed the document, which is December 18th, 2003, right?
A. Yes. If that's -- those words are on there.
Q. Why would you start investigating Michael Jackson around January 1st, 2000, if you didn't meet him till August 2000?
A. Okay. Let me explain something to you. And this has already been discussed, and he knows the answers. This was discussed at the end of September.
MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object to this part of the answer as nonresponsive.
THE COURT: Sustained.
THE WITNESS: This -- when the sheriffs were doing their investigation, they wanted to know every single detail about me. George Owen Feldman is -- I think he's associated in the same law firm of Rothstein.
So the -- the police department did an extensive, extensive search on me as a person, and so they want -- they put everything in a general form so they can have access to everything about me 6501

and my past, because they wanted to verify and make sure that what they were going to do towards this goliath was going to be accurate and truthful. And that's why this -- this paper was made in such a general way.

Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Are you now telling the jury that George Owen Feldman did represent you?

A. No, he didn't represent me.

Q. At any time?

A. No, he didn't represent me. He is one of the people inside the civil law firm. But my understanding -- my understanding was that it was only the Rothstein -- Rothstein and another attorney named Adler, another attorney named Ramieri. That was my understanding, and it still is today.

Q. Let me try and ask the question again - okay? - in a clearer form, because perhaps I was not clear. And I apologize if I wasn't.

You signed a document that said from time to time between January 1st, 2000, and the date you signed the document, you were investigating Michael Jackson through various lawyers, correct?

A. Okay. There's more information on that paperwork which he purposely has taken out of context. It's -- certain events are attached to specific attorneys. Certain situations are attached to certain attorneys.

Like I said, the police wanted to do an 6502

extensive, thorough investigation on me prior to doing it on him. So they wanted everything about me. So they made it in a general form. But he keeps taking it out of context.

MR. MESEREAU: I don't want to offend the Court, Your Honor. I don't think I actually got an answer to that, but I will leave it to the Court's discretion.

THE COURT: Ask your next question.

MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor.

Q. You did sign this document, correct?

A. Yes, I did.

MR. MESEREAU: I would move it into evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's admitted.

MR. ZONEN: I will object, given the prior ruling dealing with confidentiality of the --

MR. MESEREAU: It's redacted.

MR. ZONEN: Perhaps we could argue this at the next break or the conclusion of the proceedings.

THE COURT: All right. I'll withhold ruling on it, on its admissibility, till --

MR. MESEREAU: Shall I submit it to your clerk, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Have you numbered it?

MR. MESEREAU: I have not.

THE COURT: Will you do that now, so we have a record of what you're talking about? 6503

THE CLERK: 5007.
THE COURT: 5-0 --
THE CLERK: 5007.
THE COURT: All right. I'll withhold ruling until we hear from the District Attorney.
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor, at this time we'd like to play the rebuttal tape.
MR. SANGER: Exhibit 340.
THE COURT: 340.
Are you ready?
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Miss Arvizo, you are laughing at various times during this tape. Was that something that you scripted in advance?
A. I was nervous. Brad Miller was standing right next to the camera, right in front of me.
Q. Was the laughing something that you scripted in advance?
A. Yes. Also, Dieter wanted that included.
Q. Is everything that your son is saying memorized?
A. Everything -- they took all the information from us, information that did exist, back from Miami, and information that they had already, they studied us and got background information --
MR. MESEREAU: Move to strike, Your Honor. 6504

THE WITNESS: -- and then they put it all together.
THE COURT: Just a moment.
THE WITNESS: I answered your question.
THE COURT: I think that could be answered "yes" or "no." The question is, "Is everything that your son is saying memorized?"
THE WITNESS: Everything is -- is going according to what Dieter had scripted.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Is it memorized?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Ms. Arvizo, were the words you just articulated on that tape all memorized?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you lying on this tape?
A. No. I'm a poor actress. That's why they started the proceeding to go do the passport and the visa. That's what Vinnie had communicated to me; that what I did was inadequate.
Q. You were not lying on this tape?
A. Acting.
Q. Let me rephrase the question.
The jury just heard the words you expressed 6505

1 on the tape, right?
2 A. Correct.
3 Q. Were they lies?
4 A. Acting.
5 MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, may I request
6 that the witness be instructed to answer the
7 question?
8 THE COURT: Well, the question was, “Were
9 they lies?” And she said, “Acting.”
10 MR. MESEREAU: I can rephrase it, Your
11 Honor.
12 Q. When you said what the jury just heard you
13 say on this tape, were you telling the truth?
14 A. I was acting. I don’t know how you want me
15 to define it. I mean, you’re not going to call
16 Halle Berry and say, “Are you Catwoman?” She’s
17 going to tell you she’s acting. She’s just acting.
18 She’s not a liar.
19 I was acting. That’s it.
20 Q. Are the words you said on that tape the
21 truth?
22 MR. ZONEN: Objection; asked and answered.
23 THE COURT: Sustained.
24 (Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff’s
25 Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and
26 jury.)
27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Ms. Arvizo, was what you
28 just said about Michael Jackson being fatherly the 6506

truth?
A. Everything on here was choreographed by Dieter and Ronald, specifically Dieter, and it's all acting. And I failed at that.
Q. Are the words you spoke true or false?
A. The words I spoke were part of a script.
Q. Were you telling the truth or not?
A. I was acting.
Q. Was Gavin telling the truth or not, as far as you were concerned?
A. As far as --
MR. ZONEN: I think that's speculative. I'll object.
THE COURT: It's overly broad. I'll sustain the objection.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Was it your belief that Gavin was acting in this tape?
A. Yes, because I had seen Dieter work with my children prior to Jesus taking us back to my mom's house. I had seen Dieter work with me and my children.
Q. Did you believe that what Gavin was saying was true or false?
A. I believe, like I told you, Dieter had worked with us continuously on this script.
Q. Did you believe what Gavin said was the truth or not?
A. I believe what he was saying was keeping to 6507

the script.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Ms. Arvizo, you said that you and your children were neglected and spit on, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And who were you referring to?
A. They took elements of my life and my children's life which were truthful and incorporated it into their script. And this happened in the initial meeting in Miami. They already had -- they were already in the works on this. It took me a while to find out. And it's taken many other people to find out later, too.
Q. Who neglected your family?
A. In this script, everything is scripted. But if you're making a general question, you already have the specifics on that.
Q. When you said your family was spit on, who were you referring to?
A. On this rebuttal thing, everything is scripted. They took elements of mine and my children's life which were true and incorporated in here.
Q. When you said, "Everybody tossed us aside," who were you referring to? 6508

A. This is all scripted here.
Q. When you said, “We weren’t in the right zip code, and we weren’t the right race,” what were you referring to?
A. This was all scripted.
For those answers, you need to ask Dieter.
Q. But wouldn’t you agree that on numerous other occasions you said exactly the same thing?
A. That’s correct.
Q. You even said words to that effect on that phone call you had with Frank when you didn’t know you were being recorded.
A. That’s correct.
Q. And your answers weren’t scripted there, were they?
A. No, they weren’t. They -- like I said, they took elements of mine and my life -- mine and my children’s life and put it into this script.
Q. Well, not referring to what you say on this tape, but referring to what you said on other occasions when you didn’t know you were being recorded, what did you mean when you said, “Our family has been neglected and spit upon,” et cetera? What were you talking about?
A. Outside this rebuttal, we’re talking about David.
Q. Okay.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff’s 6509

Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)

Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Ms. Arvizo, you had been very critical of David for not defending you and your children like a father should, correct?

A. He would have to defend us from his own self.

Q. Were you critical of David for not defending you in the J.C. Penney case the way you thought he should?

A. I was not critical.

Q. Never were?

A. No, I was just -- he just stood there.

Q. Didn't you say that you had -- excuse me. Let me rephrase the question. Didn't you say on one occasion that you would forgive David for not acting like a man in that parking lot?

A. I don't remember clearly, but I can -- I can try to recall for you. I'm getting beat up on the floor. And the history is David had always been beating me up. And this one moment that he could have done something for me, he allowed these people to beat on me while I was laying flat on the floor, while he stood like a coward on -- it was like a little sidewalk. That's where he stood. If that's what you want -- 6510

Q. Okay.
A. -- that's the best I can recall.
Q. Now, you say in this tape about -- excuse me. Davellin says in this tape, about Michael, "The fact that he stood up and defended us, that's a father." Was that just scripted?
A. Okay. All this on the video, plus the outtakes, everything is scripted. Michael, when we arrived in Miami, he had like a 45-minute lovey-dovey meeting with us.
Q. Okay. And they started scripting it in Miami?
A. They must have. They must have started all this stuff way before I was even called up -- up to Miami. They must have.
Q. So they were scripting you in Miami, but you didn't know what they were doing, right?
A. Like I said, we're going to have to call Ronald, Dieter, all of them in here to find out what they were up to. Or Michael, he could come up here.
Q. Were you being scripted in Miami without knowing it?
A. I don't know. I don't know.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Miss Arvizo, is what you just said memorized? 6511

A. Yes. And -- yeah.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: As far as you were concerned, was everything Gavin just said memorized?
A. As far as I'm concerned. Like I say, I pointed out, Dieter had worked on us, with us. And also, I would like to maybe help you remember, this was --
MR. MESEREAU: Could I get a "yes" or "no" answer, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes. Do you want the question read back?
THE WITNESS: Sure, please.
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: Yes.
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 1, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Ms. Arvizo, you say that because you're with Michael, you don't have money problems, correct?
A. Scripted. And remember, this is being filmed at 3 a.m., right before the CPS meeting.
Q. Now, you say that everything the jury has just watched and heard on this videotape was memorized and rehearsed, right? 6512

A. Yes. And while I was over here, in Jay Jackson's apartment they had their claws in my three kids.
Q. How long did it take all of you to memorize all the words that the jury just heard you say?
A. Well, they worked -- Dieter -- while I was there, in my presence, Dieter worked, well, with us daily, and about on the average of ten times a day. And then when I came over here, and the children were over there, who knows how many times. That you would have to get from my children.
Q. Let's talk about you only. You said you sat down with Dieter ten times a day, correct?
A. My best estimate.
Q. And where did you do that?
A. In one of the guesthouses, the one that looked like the little boy's room. That one.
Q. This is the first time, after numerous police interviews and after going to the grand jury, that you've ever said, "I met with Dieter ten times a day to memorize my words," right?
A. No, I said, "Many times daily."
Q. Okay.
A. That's my words, but you want specific answers.
Q. So you said everything the jury just heard was memorized, and I'm just asking you how long it took you to memorize all of it. 6513

A. How long?
Q. Do you think.
A. Well, I didn't do a good job.
Q. How long do you think it took you to memorize all of this?
A. I couldn't give you an answer.
Q. Was it all memorized word for word?
A. I did my best.
Q. And was it all written out in advance?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. So how -- how many pages were in this script, if you know?
A. Well, at the end of the video right here, you can see Christian have the script himself. And probably Bradley Miller also had it, because he was standing right next to the cameraman right in front of us. Brad Miller's job was to report to Dieter if we did everything we were supposed to do.
Q. Was everything written out word for word in advance?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. They're very detailed.
Q. And you just memorized every page, true?
A. I did my best.
Q. Okay.
A. And I failed.
MR. SANGER: That was the end of that first 6514

1 disk. We have the second disk.
2 THE COURT: I understand.
3 You ready?
4 MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor.
5 MR. SANGER: Oh, we've got to -- just a
6 second.
7 THE COURT: Do you want me to put it on
8 "Black"?
9 MR. SANGER: Oh, you can leave it on. I
10 just wanted to squelch the high-pitched tone that
11 would be otherwise heard.
12 THE COURT: That was pretty good of you to
13 remember that.
14 (Whereupon, a portion of a CD, Plaintiff's
15 Exhibit No. 340, Disk 2, was played for the Court
16 and jury.)
17 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Miss Arvizo, was what you
18 just said memorized word for word?
19 A. Yes, I tried to do my best.
20 MR. MESEREAU: Do you want to take a break
21 at this point, Your Honor?
22 THE COURT: That would be good. Thank you.
23 (Recess taken.)
24 THE COURT: Mr. Mesereau?
25 MR. MESEREAU: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
26 Q. Miss Arvizo, before we continue with the
27 tape, I'd like to clarify something. Did you tell
28 the jury earlier that even the outtakes were 6515

scripted?
A. Yes. Everything. The whole entire -- from the moment we got to Hamid's house, Brad Miller there -- was there, Michael's P.I.
Q. So when you said about Gavin, "He was doing gang signs. That was what he was doing. He's -- he shot out to his friends on the west side," was that all scripted?
A. Everything; everything was scripted.
Q. Okay. We can continue.
THE BAILIFF: You need to push the "DVD" button.
MR. SANGER: I pushed "DVD." I'm going to pause for a second. Shall we just pick up? We missed ten seconds, but I'll just go ahead.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Miss Arvizo, this is the portion of the videotape where you refer to the Department of Child Social Services, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you told the jury that you were criticized for referring to them in the videotape, right?
A. As I told you before, I got in trouble by -- because I mentioned -- I went off the script with God, cancer, and the Child Welfare Services, those three things --
Q. Okay.
A. -- specifically, Vinnie told me. 6516

Q. So now you're off the script --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when you criticize the Department of Child Social Services, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were speaking of your own free will when you said that, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you said, "So where are all these people that -- that have all of a sudden this care and concern throwing the child advocacy group on me, the Department of Child Social Services," you were telling the truth, correct?
A. At that point where I went off, God, the Child Welfare Services, and the cancer, so that one word.
Q. Were you criticizing the Department of Child Social Services?
A. No. That one word I went off the script, and so I got in trouble for it.
Q. Were you criticizing the Department of Child Social Services?
A. No. That was part of the script, the child advocacy.
Q. That was part of the script?
A. Yes. I added the -- the Child Welfare Services in a way that was off the script.
Q. And why were you criticizing that agency? 6517

A. Well, I had the Child Welfare Services meeting that morning, and it blurted out, so I got in trouble for it.
Q. Were you worried about the meeting?
A. No -- yeah, I was worried about the meeting, so I got in trouble for that.
Q. So you were being critical of DCFS, correct?
A. No, no, I wasn't. That came out.
Q. It came out, but you were --
A. No, the word, the one word, "Child"....
MR. MESEREAU: We can move on. /
(Whereupon, a portion of a DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 340, Disk 2, was played for the Court and jury.)
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Ms. Arvizo, everything said in this interview was memorized, correct?
A. Everything was except for what I got in trouble for. Those are the three things. I was supposed to say that Michael healed Gavin --
MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, could I -- could the Court admonish the witness to just answer the question?
THE COURT: Yes.
Just answer the question.
THE WITNESS: I thought I was answering it.
THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Everything was memorized word for word, right? 6518

A. Yes, except when I blurted out the little meeting that I was going to have in a matter of hours. I wasn't supposed to blurt that out. And I did. I failed.
Q. Now, you told the jury yesterday that during this period of time where you claim your family was falsely imprisoned, that you never reported it to the police, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you told them that you didn't report it to the police because you thought no police officer in Los Angeles would believe you, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And because you thought no police officer would ever believe you, you never talked about being held against your will, right?
A. Is that a question?
MR. ZONEN: Objection; vague. To whom?
MR. MESEREAU: Let me rephrase it.
Q. What is the period of time that you claim you and your family were held against your will by people associated with Mr. Jackson?
A. From -- approximately from February to March.
Q. And --
A. That's my best estimate.
Q. And what date was this rebuttal video, if you know? 6519

A. This was -- the best I can remember is being taken there on the 19th about 11 p.m. at night, approximately. And then it went into the morning of the 20th, was filmed at about 3 a.m. And that morning, about nine o'clock, was the meeting.
Q. During the time you claim your family was held against their will, were you in contact with any police officers?
A. No.
Q. Do you know a Los Angeles police officer named Andrew Lassak?
A. Officer Lassak, yes, I do.
Q. Who is Officer Lassak?
A. Officer Lassak is a friend.
Q. How long has he been your friend?
A. He's been my friend since I think approximately -- let me see. Oh, you know, after David was arrested from domestic violence. That period of, I think, about 2001.
Q. And during the period of time you claim you were being held against your will, you were communicating with Andrew Lassak, correct?
A. No, that's incorrect.
Q. Well, do you remember an interview you had with the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department where you mentioned Andrew Lassak?
A. Yes.
Q. Remember while you were discussing what 6520

Vinnie was doing, you told the interviewer, “He’s one of the LAPD officers that I had told him about things that were happening?” Do you remember that?
A. I don’t think you’re saying it correctly. You’re leaving things out from the beginning and in front of that.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection to see what you told the Santa Barbara sheriffs when you were interviewed?
A. No. You don’t need to -- I’m saying to you, you’re not saying it completely to the jurors. What he’s trying to say is I was -- after I met with Mr. Dickerman and Mr. -- in the process of that, of the attorneys, I tried to reach Officer Lassak. And in between that was when I had contacted him in order to get help to let him know what was going on.
And then in the midst of that, that’s when the sheriffs, the Santa Barbara sheriffs got involved, and the Santa Barbara sheriffs, which is on my police report, stated that he didn’t need to get involved, that it happened over here, so therefore they’re the ones that are going to take over the investigation.
Q. During the time you claim you were falsely imprisoned, you had phone conversations with Andrew Lassak, correct?
A. Incorrect. 6521

Q. Okay.
A. But during the police interview, yes.
Q. He is with the Hollenbeck Division, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. The Hollenbeck Division of the Los Angeles Police Department is the division where your Soto Street address is, right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And you're saying you never told anyone from the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department that you were in communication with Andrew Lassak during that period of time?
A. When we were having a police interview, Officer Lassak happened to call because I was trying to put in a call, like I said, between the attorneys and the Santa Barbara sheriffs. This period was Officer Lassak, way after Neverland, because finally I was able to make contact with him.
Q. Do you remember telling Officer Lassak, "Something big is happening. I can't talk about it. I have lawyers"?
A. I never said something like that.
Q. So if he said you said that, that wouldn't be true?
MR. ZONEN: Objection. Argumentative; speculative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you know an LAPD 6522

officer named Patrick Metoyer?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. When did you meet Patrick Metoyer?
A. Officer -- the same time Officer Lassak, I met him.
Q. And what year would that be?
A. That would be in 2001.
Q. Did you know a Sergeant Milt Hernandez from the LAPD?
A. And Officer Metoyer is no longer working for LAPD.
Q. Did you know a Sergeant Milt Hernandez from the LAPD?
A. That -- that name doesn't sound familiar.
Q. Do you remember talking to him? He's with the Hollenbeck Division.
A. I think what you're trying to refer to is someone who was there as a watch commander or something like that.
But not a friend. He's not a friend.
Q. When did you first meet him?
MR. ZONEN: Who's "him"? Objection; vague.
MR. MESEREAU: Milt Hernandez.
Q. When did you first meet him?
A. If it's the same --
MR. ZONEN: Objection; assuming facts not in evidence that she ever met him.
MR. MESEREAU: I'll rephrase it, Your Honor. 6523

Q. Did you ever meet Sergeant Milt Hernandez from the Hollenbeck Division?
A. No, never.
Q. Did you ever speak to him on the phone?
A. If it's the same person, I think it was inquiring about the LAPD Explorers, because I was interested in moving Davellin from the Wall Street Central Division up to the Hollenbeck Division, if that's --
Q. And approximately when did you talk to him, if you remember?
A. I don't remember.
Q. You said you first met LAPD Officer Andrew Lassak --
A. And this is the best I can remember.
Q. You said you first met LAPD Officer Andrew Lassak in 2001; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And how did you meet him?
A. I think it was because of a call or something like that.
Q. And what are you talking about?
A. That's the best I can remember.
Q. You said it's a call about something?
A. Yeah, that's the best I can remember.
Q. Did you call him?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Did he call you? 6524

A. No.
Q. Did you ever ask him to assist you or your family in anything?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever ask him to drive you home?
A. Not me personally.
Q. Did he ever drive you home?
A. I think so, yes. In the LAPD car, yes. I do recall that.
Q. And when did LAPD Officer Andrew Lassak drive you home?
A. He drove me home because I had -- both my feet were operated.
Q. And how did you get in touch with him?
A. I think there was a call, a request for help, and he helped me out. I don't really recall.
Q. He drove you home from the welfare department, didn't he?
A. Yeah, I think so. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Okay. And through him, you met a number of LAPD officers, did you not?
A. Yes. Just met, not friends.
Q. And they were in the Hollenbeck Division where your Soto Street home was, correct?
A. That's correct. And I don't know any of their names.
Q. And you met all these officers in approximately 2001, right? 6525

A. This is correct.
Q. You also met some officers from the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, also called MTA, right?
A. This is correct.
Q. And who did you meet from the MTA -- excuse me, let me rephrase that.
What police officers did you know from the MTA?
A. That department, to the best I can remember, was dissolved. It's no longer. They were all sent out to different departments, because that was -- that had ended. But I did get to meet - which I completely lost contact with them - I think it was a female officer and a male officer. No, actually -- yeah. That was the initial officers I met, yes. But they're no longer existent.
Q. How do you know that?
A. Because I drove -- I rode the bus frequently and I never got to see them again anymore. They were substituted by private security. Because LAPD used to run the metro department.
Q. Did you ever meet a Sergeant Chiu from the Rampart Division?
A. Sergeant Chiu. That name doesn't sound familiar.
Q. How about a Cindy Garcia?
A. I may have. But it doesn't sound familiar. 6526

Q. How about a Detective Angulo, A-n-g-u-l-o,
from the Hollenbeck Division?
A. It doesn't sound familiar. Because of
Officer Lassak, I got to meet a lot of officers, but
they weren't my friends. Just when he was doing his
patrol, he would stop by and he would have someone
with him. He was -- what are those officers called
when they're -- oh, he was a training officer. So
he constantly had someone he was training.
Q. And at one point you had LAPD Officer
Lassak's cell phone number, didn't you?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you remember the number?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And he did some nice things for you and your
family, didn't he?
A. Yes, he -- he was our friend.
Q. Please tell the jury the nice things that
LAPD Officer Andrew Lassak did for you and your
family.
MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as
irrelevant.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Ms. Arvizo, the truth is,
you knew a lot of police officers near where you
lived, you could have called any of them and said
you were the victim of crime, and you didn't, right?
A. It would have been helpful, but Officer 6527

Lassak was recently married in about June. And out of respect I figured he's got a new wife, and it's best that I don't communicate with him. So I lost communication the day he got married, right before.
Q. Did you ever hear of a group called Big Brother or Adopt-a-Family?
A. No, but -- no, but I came to find out now that maybe those kind of things are --
Q. I'm sorry?
A. That's what I told you.
Q. Okay. When you were interviewed by Santa Barbara sheriffs --
A. Yes.
Q. -- did you ever mention that you had met Andrew Lassak and a bunch of other officers through a group called Big Brother or Adopt-a-Family?
A. I think that was Officer Robel or Officer Zelis that mentioned that. It wasn't I that said that.
Q. Excuse me. Let me rephrase that. Did you ever participate with LAPD Officer Andrew Lassak in any type of group involving family support in East Los Angeles?
A. Okay, Officer -- I think I know what you're referring to if --
Q. Yeah, whatever -- please tell the jury whatever it is.
A. Okay, Officer Lassak -- usually all the 6528

department -- this is what was explained to me. Each officer personally picks someone, someone from the community or someone they like, or anything, and they put their name into some kind of -- I don't know how it works, but this is how I came to understand. That they put their name into some -- something, and then they pick families out of there. And that's it.

Q. And was your family chosen to participate?

A. Yes. Officer Lassak put me and my kids in there.

Q. Approximately when was this?

A. This was in -- I don't remember. But it was Christmas.

Q. Do you know approximately what year?

A. No, I wouldn't be able to tell you that, but I know it was Christmas.

Q. Was it before you think you met Michael Jackson?

A. No, it was after. Because I -- like I said, I met Officer Lassak after David was arrested.

Q. And for the jury's benefit, approximately when was David arrested?

A. About -- I don't know. My best estimate, September, October of 2001. That's my best estimate.

Q. And in your interview with the Santa Barbara sheriffs, you said that Mr. Lassak would come with 6529

different officers and make jokes, right?
A. Yes. He would -- like I said, Officer Lassak, even though he was a corporal, he's also a training officer. And he would bring different officers, and he would stand in the doorway, and he'd make jokes with the kids.
Q. Now, which doorway was this?
A. My front door to my apartment.
Q. Okay. And you said he'd get a big kick out of the kids telling him jokes, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know who the officers are that he used to bring to your front door?
A. I wouldn't be able to tell you, because the majority of them never came twice. They just would come once.
Q. How many would he often bring -- excuse me, let me rephrase that.
How many officers would Mr. Lassak bring to your house at one time?
A. Well, whoever he was training at that time.
Q. What's the largest number of officers he ever brought to your house?
A. Well, him and the other person he was training.
Q. And did you ever go to the police department to see him, where he worked?
A. I don't think so. 6530

Q. Did you used to see Officer Lassak driving around the Hollenbeck Division?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you were a friend of his for a number of years, weren't you?
A. Up until he got married. Because when he got married, I felt it's a new marriage, and out of respect, he needs to dedicate himself to his wife. And I don't think it would be very respectful for me to be a friend when he's supposed to be dedicating his time to his new wife.
Q. Okay. Do you remember the names of other officers in the Hollenbeck Division that you knew around the time Officer Lassak used to come to your doorway?
A. Only Officer Lassak.
Q. Did Officer Lassak ever arrange any type of fund-raiser for your family?
A. No, outside from him putting -- putting us in that Christmas thing, that's it. No fund-raiser.
Q. Now, what Christmas thing was this?
A. It was -- every officer picks somebody and they put it in like a bag, and that's it.
Q. Okay. And where did this take place?
A. In the Hollenbeck Division.
Q. And what location did this Christmas event take place?
A. In the Hollenbeck Division. 6531

Q. Okay. Was that at the police station?
A. I think it was.
Q. Did you bring your children to the police station?
A. I didn't go.
Q. Did your family participate in that event?
A. Yes.
Q. How?
A. Officer Lassak had came by and told the kids that on this day they were going to have like a Christmas party. And that's it.
Q. And who went to the Christmas party from your family?
A. Davellin, Gavin and Star.
Q. Okay. And this is after 2001, right?
A. It definitely has to be, because it was -- I met Officer Lassak after David was arrested, and that's my best estimate.
Q. When is the last time you spoke to Attorney Larry Feldman? Don't say what you said. That's confidential. But when was the last time you spoke to Attorney Larry Feldman?
A. I -- I wouldn't be able to tell. I couldn't remember.
Q. Have you been in any communication with him in the last month?
A. Let me see. Let me see. No. It's only the times that I was 6532

receiving subpoenas from your office was -- yeah, that's the best I can remember.
Q. Have you talked to him in the last couple weeks?
A. I don't think so. I've been here.
Q. Have you talked to Attorney Larry Feldman in the last couple of weeks?
A. Let me see. You know what? When was -- when did he testify?
Q. I can't answer questions.
A. Oh, okay. I'm only saying that would help me remember. Because it was before that time.
Q. Have you talked to Attorney Larry Feldman while this trying has been going on?
A. Oh, yes, yes.
Q. How many times?
A. Oh, I wouldn't be able to tell you that. Just about every time you sent a subpoena.
Q. Okay. Would it be accurate to say that while this trial has been going on you've talked to him more than once?
A. Oh, yes. Every time they sent a subpoena.
Q. Okay.
THE COURT: Counsel, there may be a little ambiguity there as to, "while the trial has been going on."
MR. MESEREAU: Oh, okay. I understand.
THE COURT: What "the trial" is to some 6533

people is different than others.
MR. MESEREAU: Sure. Let me rephrase it.
Q. You're aware that Attorney Larry Feldman testified in this trial, right?
A. Yep. Yes.
Q. How did you know that?
A. Because I had seen "Accuser's Mother's Attorney Testifies." I seen that, something like that.
Q. Okay. Within the last few months, you've been in contact with Attorney Larry Feldman, have you not?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. You've been in contact with him on a number of occasions?
A. Yes, every time they sent a subpoena over.
Q. Okay. Okay. Now, I think you've answered this question, but let me just be specific.
A. Okay.
Q. All of these officers you met through LAPD, Officer Andrew Lassak, starting with the year 2001, none of them were ever contacted by you about false imprisonment, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. None of those --
A. Until when I tried afterwards between Mr. Dickerman and the Santa Barbara sheriffs. And on your thing they said, "Don't talk to any other 6534

officers but their department so the investigation wouldn't be compromised."
Q. Before you went to Attorney William Dickerman, you never contacted any of these officers or trainees that you knew in your neighborhood about anything you claim Michael Jackson was doing?
A. That's correct. I was afraid to talk on the phone, because they were monitoring, listening and surveilling me and following me. That's correct.
Q. Even when you were at your parents' home, you never called LAPD Officer Andrew Lassak and complained, right?
A. Because at this point I didn't have his phone number.
Q. When did you lose it?
A. When he got married, out of respect, I seized my communication with him.
Q. Well, you'd been to the Hollenbeck Division Police Department before, right?
A. Yes, I had.
Q. Did you ever contact anyone from the Hollenbeck Division Police Department and complain about Michael Jackson?
A. Well, I no longer belong to their division. I know -- because my apartment, because of them, is no more existent there, so I'm not their problem anymore.
Q. You still could have called them, couldn't 6535

you?
A. I didn't. Because of being monitored, followed, surveilled, listened to.
Q. You didn't call them from Jay Jackson's apartment, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You didn't call them from your parents' home in El Monte, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You didn't call them from Soto Street while you were living there, correct?
A. That's correct. But I told the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department.
Q. After you went to Attorney Larry Feldman, right?
A. No. Before. Jay Jackson called in about February and that's when we communicated. That was our first communication.
Q. You didn't fill out a police report with any police department about anything until you went to Attorney Larry Feldman, right?
A. We made contact with sheriffs, Santa Barbara sheriffs, back in February. They were not helpful to us. So there was this big gap until afterwards.
Q. When did you first meet Attorney Larry Feldman?
A. After Mr. Bill Dickerman introduced me to him. 6536

Q. Do you know about when that was?
A. I wouldn't be able to tell you. But they could tell you best.
Q. To your knowledge, how long has Attorney Larry Feldman been giving you advice? Don't say what the advice is. I'm just asking you, as far as you know, how long has Attorney Larry Feldman been giving you advice?
A. I'm a little confused by the question, because he's helped more than gave me advice, when you guys have been bomb -- giving me all those subpoenas.
Q. I understand.
A. That they even wanted my school records all the way till I was a kindergartner myself.
MR. MESEREAU: Move to strike, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Just a moment.
That's stricken.
Do you want to rephrase the question?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes.
Q. If you know, for how many years has Attorney Larry Feldman been giving you advice?
THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I'm having difficulty with it. I'm telling you, "help" and "advice" to me is different.
THE COURT: She's asking you to clarify the question. That's --
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What you say to an 6537

attorney is confidential, and I'm not asking you about your conversations. Okay?
I'm just asking you how long, in your mind, Attorney Larry Feldman has been helping you. We'll use the word "help."
A. Okay. Well, he felt that your defense team was bullies.
MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. MESEREAU: Move to strike.
THE COURT: Stricken.
MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, could the witness be admonished to answer the question?
THE COURT: Ask the question again or have the question read back, please.
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: Okay. Every time they -- they were sending me the subpoena, for example, requesting all my school records, all the way till I was a kindergartner, he's been helping me.
Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Let me ask it one more time. But if I'm not clear, just tell me.
A. Okay.
Q. What year did you meet Attorney Larry Feldman?
A. In 2003.
Q. You knew some police officers from the MTA, did you not? 6538

A. Yes, I did. I did meet them, but it was not a close contact, as I was with Officer Lassak, which I stopped because he had gotten married, and that was it. And they no longer were in existence, because a private security company took over the metro bus division. So I lost complete contact of them.
Q. And MTA means Metropolitan Transportation Authority, correct?
A. Yes. They're underneath the ground. They're police officers that were underneath the ground taking care of the trains that run -- I don't know whether they're train or metro rail. I don't know the correct --
Q. And you knew a number of officers with the MTA, correct?
A. When that was dissolved, my -- as far as my relationship was with them, every time me and my children rode the trains, when we would see them we'd say hello. But past that, once they were -- I don't know what the word is. When they were gone, no more, I didn't see them anymore.
Q. And how many officers from the MTA do you think you knew, when you knew them?
A. It was about two. A male and a female, and the rest were by sight. Every time we'd see them, we'd say hello. But there was definitely more than two that I recognized by face. 6539

Q. And were they stationed in the Hollenbeck area?
A. No, they weren't stationed in the Hollenbeck area.
Q. Where were they stationed?
A. They were stationed -- to my understanding, they were stationed right there, underneath the ground in the train rail system.
Q. And didn't these MTA officers help your family out also?
A. Well, I don't know if you call it help, but they also did some Christmas thing.
Q. And what was that?
A. They -- they took a liking to the kids, because they saw the kids go off and on the trains, and so -- and that was it.
Q. And approximately when did this happen?
A. Christmastime.
Q. Approximately what year, if you know?
A. I don't remember. But I do remember Christmastime.
Q. Was it after 2001?
A. Oh. Oh, yes, yes. After -- after David was arrested, me and my kids became free to have -- to go beyond having friendships.
Q. And after David was arrested, it would be accurate to say that you and your kids had a lot of friends who were police officers, right? 6540

A. The only one we could say is Officer Lassak. That's it. The rest were just people that we met, but completely lost contact with.
Q. And through Major Jay Jackson, did you meet anyone in the United States Army?
A. Not really. I -- no. I don't even go to -- when Jay would have, like, gatherings from the Army, I prefer not to go. Even to his -- even to his going-away luncheon, because I knew I wasn't smart enough to be in that kind of group.
THE COURT: Counsel, is this a good place to stop?
MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. We're going to recess for the weekend. Remember next Wednesday afternoon, we're not going to be in session. I'll see you Monday at 8:30. Remember the admonitions. Don't talk to anybody. Don't read anything. Enjoy the weekend.
MR. SANGER: When are we not in session?
THE COURT: Wednesday afternoon.
MR. SANGER: Wednesday afternoon we're not in session. We're here Monday.
(The proceedings adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)
--o0o--

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE)
OF CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

I, MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304, Official Court Reporter, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing pages 6423 through 6541 contain a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within and above-entitled matter as by me taken down in shorthand writing at said proceedings on April 15, 2005, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

DATED: Santa Maria, California, April 15, 2005.

MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304